This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

STANFORD LAW
LIBRARY

IN
MEMORY OF
HENRY VROOMAN

8155.2 V5

Southbridge Public Library.
CHARGED FOR TWO WEEKS.
May be renewed unless required by other readers.
A library card entitles the holder to draw one work of fiction and, at the same time, a reasonable number of other books.

Taken by	Due	Taken by	Due

SOUTHBRIDGE PUBLIC LIBRARY. DISCARDED.

AN
BSY
LMw
v.5

THE

WORKS

OF

CHARLES SUMNER.

Veniet fortasse aliud tempus, dignius nostro, quo, debellatis odiis, veritas triumphabit. Hoc mecum opta, lector, et vale.

LEIBNITZ.

SOUTHBRIDGE
PUBLIC LIBRARY.
DISCARDED.

VOL. V.

BOSTON:
LEE AND SHEPARD.
1874.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1872,
BY CHARLES SUMNER,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

University Press: Welch, Bigelow, & Co.,
Cambridge.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V.

PAGE

THE BARBARISM OF SLAVERY. Speech in the Senate, on Bill for Admission of Kansas as a Free State, June 4, 1860 . . . 1

A VICTORY OF PRINCIPLE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION. Letter to a Public Meeting at Middleborough, Massachusetts, June 11, 1860 175

REFUSAL TO COLORED PERSONS OF RIGHT OF PETITION. Notes of undelivered Speech in the Senate, on Resolution refusing to receive Petition from Citizens of Massachusetts of African Descent, June 15, 1860 176

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN SCHWARTZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA. Speech in the Senate, on Resolutions in Tribute to him, June 21, 1860 188

UNHESITATING ASSERTION OF OUR PRINCIPLES. Letter to the Republicans of New York City, June 27, 1860 190

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY: ITS ORIGIN, NECESSITY, AND PERMANENCE. Speech before the Young Men's Republican Union of New York, at Cooper Institute, July 11, 1860 191

OUR CANDIDATES WILL BE ELECTED. Letter to the Lincoln and Hamlin Club of Owego, New York, July 30, 1860 230

EMANCIPATION IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIES A BLESSING, AND NOT A FAILURE. Letter to a Public Meeting at Framingham, Massachusetts, July 30, 1860 231

SLAVERY A BARBAROUS DISEASE TO BE STAYED. Letter to a Republican Meeting at the Dedication of the Republican Wigwam in New York, August 6, 1860 234

TRIBUTE TO A COLLEGE CLASSMATE. Remarks on the Late John W. Browne, August 20, 1860 236

PAGE

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND THE ISSUES. Speech at the State Convention of the Republican Party at Worcester, August 29, 1860 240

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SLAVERY SHOWN FROM ITS BARBARISM. Letter to a Political Antislavery Convention at Worcester, Massachusetts, September 9, 1860 269

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT MUST BE A DEAD LETTER. Letter to a Public Meeting at Syracuse, New York, September 9, 1860 . . 271

EXAMPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS AGAINST SLAVERY. Speech at a Mass Meeting of Republicans, in the Open Air, at Myrick's Station, Massachusetts, September 18, 1860 273

CONTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOLS FOR STATUE OF HORACE MANN. Letter to the Agent for receiving Contributions, September 19, 1860 288

REMINISCENCE OF THE LATE THEODORE PARKER. Remarks at the Annual Opening of the Fraternity Lectures of Boston, October 1, 1860 290

THREAT OF DISUNION BY THE SLAVE STATES, AND ITS ABSURDITY. Speech at a Mass Meeting of Republicans, in the Open Air, at Framingham, Massachusetts, October 11, 1860 . 293

NO POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IN TERRITORIES CAN ESTABLISH SLAVERY. Speech in the Mechanics' Hall, Worcester, November 1, 1860 309

EVENING BEFORE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION. Speech at Faneuil Hall, Boston, November 5, 1860 333

EVENING AFTER THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION. Speech to the Wide-Awakes of Concord, Massachusetts, November 7, 1860 . 344

JOY AND SORROW IN THE RECENT ELECTION. Letter to the Wide-Awakes of Boston, at their Festival, after Election, November 9, 1860 348

THE VICTORY AND PRESENT DUTIES. Speech to the Wide-Awakes, at Providence, Rhode Island, November 16, 1860 350

MODERATION IN VICTORY; STANDING BY OUR PRINCIPLES. Speech to the Wide-Awakes of Lowell, November 21, 1860 . . . 354

MEMORIAL STONES OF THE WASHINGTONS IN ENGLAND. Letter to Jared Sparks, Historian of Washington, Nov. 22, 1860. From the Boston Daily Advertiser 357

PAGE

LAFAYETTE, THE FAITHFUL ONE. Address at the Cooper Institute, New York, November 30, 1860 369

DISUNION AND A SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY: THE OBJECT. Remarks in the Senate, December 10, 1860 433

ATTEMPT AT COMPROMISE: THE CRITTENDEN PROPOSITIONS. Incidents and Notes, December 18, 1860, to March 4, 1861 . . 437

ANXIETIES AND PROSPECTS DURING THE WINTER. Letters to John A. Andrew, Governor of Massachusetts, January 17 to February 20, 1861 454

NO SURRENDER OF THE NORTHERN FORTS. Speech in the Senate, on a Massachusetts Petition in Favor of the Crittenden Propositions, February 12, 1861 468

DUTY AND STRENGTH OF THE COMING ADMINISTRATION. From Notes of undelivered Speech on the various Propositions of Compromise, February, 1861 481

FOREIGN RELATIONS: ARBITRATION. Report from Committee on Foreign Relations, advising the President to submit the San Juan Boundary Question to Arbitration, in the Senate, March 19, 1861. 484

BEGINNING OF THE CONFLICT. Speech before the Third Massachusetts Rifles, in the Armory at New York, April 21, 1861 . 492

PASSPORTS FOR COLORED CITIZENS. Note to the Secretary of State, June 27, 1861 497

OBJECT OF THE WAR. Proceedings in the Senate, on the Crittenden Resolution declaring the Object of the War, July 24 and 25, 1861 499

SYMPATHIES OF THE CIVILIZED WORLD NOT TO BE REPELLED. Speech in the Senate, against Increase of Ten per Cent on all Foreign Duties, July 29, 1861 502

SOUTHBRIDGE
PUBLIC LIBRARY,
DISCARDED.

THE BARBARISM OF SLAVERY.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON THE BILL FOR THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS AS A FREE STATE, JUNE 4, 1860.

Thou art a slave, whom Fortune's tender arm
With favor never clasped, but bred a dog.
SHAKESPEARE, *Timon of Athens*, Act IV. Sc. 3.

A universe of death, which God by curse
Created evil, for evil only good,
Where all life dies, death lives, and Nature breeds,
Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things.
MILTON, *Paradise Lost*, Book II. 622–625.

Onward! onward!
With the night-wind,
Over field and farm and forest,
Lonely homestead, darksome hamlet,
Blighting all we breathe upon!
LONGFELLOW, *Golden Legend*.

Instrumenti genus vocale, et semivocale, et mutum: *vocale, in quo sunt servi;* semivocale, in quo sunt boves; mutum, in quo sunt plaustra. — VARRO, *De Re Rustica*, Lib. I. cap. xvii. § 1.

Nil metuunt jurare, nihil promittere parcunt;
Dicta nihil metuere, nihil perjuria curant.

CATULLUS, *Carm.* LXIV. 146, 148.

Pone crucem servo. — Meruit quo crimine servus
Supplicium? quis testis adest? quis detulit? Audi:
Nulla unquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est. —
O demens, ita servus homo est? Nil fecerit, esto:
Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.

JUVENAL, *Sat.* VI. 219-223.

There is a tradition of the Prophet having said, that the greatest mortification at the Day of Judgment will be when the pious slave is carried to Paradise and the wicked master condemned to Hell. — SAADI, *The Gulistan*, tr. Gladwin, p. 242.

"And the Black Oppressor am I called. And for this reason I am called the Black Oppressor, that there is not a single man around me whom I have not oppressed, and justice have I done unto none." . . . . "Since thou hast, indeed, been an oppressor so long," said Peredur, "I will cause that thou continue so no longer." So he slew him. — *The Mabinogion*, tr. Lady Charlotte Guest, Vol. I. pp. 341, 342.

After we had secured these people, I called the linguists, and ordered them to bid the men-negroes between decks be quiet (for there was a great noise amongst them). On their being silent, I asked, What had induced them to mutiny? They answered, *I was a great rogue to buy them* in order to carry them away from their own country, and that they were resolved to regain their liberty, if possible. — SNELGRAVE, *New Account of some Parts of Guinea and the Slave-Trade*, p. 170.

A system of concubinage was practised among them worse than the loose polygamy of the savages: the savage had as many women as consented to become his wives; the colonist as many as he could enslave. There is an ineffaceable stigma upon the Europeans in their intercourse with those whom they treat as inferior races; there is a perpetual contradiction between their lust and their avarice. The planter will one day take a slave for his harlot, and sell her the next as a being of some lower species, a beast of labor. If she be indeed an inferior animal, what shall be said of the one action? If she be equally with himself a human being and an immortal soul, what shall be said of the other? Either way there is a crime committed against human nature. — SOUTHEY, *History of Brazil*, Chap. VIII., Vol. I. p. 258.

Negro slavery exists in no part of the world without producing indolence, licentiousness, and inhumanity in the whites; and these vices draw after them their earthly punishment, — to look no further into their fearful, but assured consequences. — IBID., Chap. XLIV., Vol. III. p. 816.

I had observed much, and heard more, of the cruelty of masters towards their negroes; but now I received an authentic account of some horrid instances thereof. The giving a child a slave of its own age to tyrannize over, to beat and abuse out of sport, was, I myself saw, a common practice. Nor is it strange, being thus trained up in cruelty, they should after-

wards arrive at so great perfection in it; that Mr. Star. a gentleman I often met at Mr. Lasserre's, should, as he himself informed L., first nail up a negro by the ears, then order him to be whipped in the severest manner, and then to have scalding water thrown over him, so that the poor creature could not stir for four months after. Another much applauded punishment is drawing their slaves' teeth. One Colonel LYNCH is universally known to have cut off a poor negro's legs, and to kill several of them every year by his barbarities. — REV. CHARLES WESLEY, *Journal*, Charleston, S. C, August 2, 1736.

You are to have no regard to the health, strength, comfort, natural affections, or moral feelings, or intellectual endowments of my negroes. You are only to consider what subsistence to allow them and what labor to exact of them will subserve my interest. According to the most accurate calculation I can make, the proportion of subsistence and labor which will work them up in six years upon an average is the most profitable to the planter. And this allowance, surely, is very humane; for we estimate here the lives of our coal-heavers, upon an average, at only two years, ... and our soldiers and seamen no matter what. — *A West-India Planter's Instructions for his Overseers:* JOHN ADAMS, *Works*, Vol. X. pp. 339, 340.

The unfortunate man would have been tried upon five other indictments, some of them still more atrocious than the one upon which he was found guilty; and his general character for barbarity was so notorious that no room was left for me even to deliberate. His victims have been numerous: some of them were even buried in their chains, and there have been found upon the bones taken from the grave chains and iron rings of near forty pounds' weight. . . . . He had been three times married, has left several children; he had been in the Army, had a liberal education, and lived in what is called the great world. His manners and address were those of a gentleman. Cruelty appears in him to have been the effect of violence of temper, *and habit had made him regardless of the death and suffering of a slave.* — RIGHT HON. HUGH ELLIOT, Governor of the Leeward Islands: *Memoir*, by the COUNTESS OF MINTO, pp. 409, 410.

Is slavery less slavery in a Christian than in a Mahometan country? I entreat your attention, while I plead the general cause of humanity. In such a cause it is right to appeal to your sensibility as well as your reason. It is now no longer time to flatter petty tyrants by acknowledging that color constitutes a legitimate title for holding men in abject and perpetual bondage. In support of this usurpation what can be urged but the law of the strongest? — COL. DAVID HUMPHREYS, *Valedictory Discourse before the Cincinnati of Connecticut*, July 4, 1804, p. 29.

Christianity suppressed slavery, but the Christians of the sixteenth century reëstablished it, — as an exception, indeed, to their social system, and restricted to one of the races of mankind; but the wound thus inflicted

upon humanity, though less extensive, was far more difficult of cure. — TOCQUEVILLE, *Democracy in America*, ed. Bowen, Chap. XVIII. sec. 2, Vol. I. p. 457.

The Kentuckian delights in violent bodily exertion; he is familiar with the use of arms, and is accustomed from a very early age to expose his life in single combat. . . . . Were I inclined to continue this parallel, I could easily prove that almost all the differences which may be remarked between the characters of the Americans in the Southern and in the Northern States have originated in Slavery. — IBID., pp. 467, 468.

I visited our State Penitentiary a short time since, and from my own personal observation I am led to the inevitable conclusion that the plan of sending our slaves to the Penitentiary, as a *punishment* for crime, is exactly the reverse: it is rather a reward than punishment. "Let sober reason judge."

We punish offenders to prevent crime. I would ask any reasonable man, Is the sending a slave of any of our farms to the Penitentiary a punishment? The white man is punished by being deprived of his liberty for that length of time: what liberty is the slave deprived of? He has as much, and oftentimes *more*, liberty within the walls of the Penitentiary than on any of those large sugar or cotton plantations. Then where is the punishment? We send white men there, and the dread of going is a *stain* on his character: what character has the negro to lose? Hence we must come to the conclusion that sending negro slaves to the Penitentiary is not a punishment.

A moment's reflection will convince any man who has ever had the management of negroes on a plantation, that the well-being and safety of societies demand that any offence committed by a negro, for which the *lash* is not a sufficient punishment, *death* should be the penalty.

Taking these things into consideration, would it not be just and laudable to sell all negroes now in the Penitentiary to the highest bidder, on or about the first of November next, by the Sheriff of the Parish of East Baton Rouge, on the same terms and conditions that negroes are sold at present, under an ordinary *fi. fa.*, and, as near as can be, two thirds of the net proceeds of each negro be paid to the former owners or their legal representatives, the balance be and remain in the State Treasury for ordinary purposes? — *Weekly Advocate*, Baton Rouge, La., Jan. 17, 1858.

A VERY large edition of this speech was printed at Washington, immediately after its delivery. Another appeared at Boston, with a portrait; and another at San Francisco, with the Republican Platform. While the Rebellion was still warring on the National Government, an edition was brought out in New York by the "Young Men's Republican Union," to which Mr. Sumner prefixed a Dedication to the Young Men of the United States, which will be found in its proper place, according to date, in this collection.

A letter from that devoted friend of the Slave, the late George L. Stearns, of Boston, under date of March 1st, 1860, shows something of the outside prompting under which Mr. Sumner spoke.

"I have just read ———'s speech. He stands up to the mark *well*, for a politician; but we want one who believes a Man is greater than a President, and who would not lift his finger to obtain the best office in the gift of our nation, to raise this question above the political slough into its true position. Charles O'Conor, in his late speech in New York, affirmed, that, 'if Slavery were not a wise and beneficent institution for the black as well as the white, it could not be defended.' We want you to take up the gauntlet that he has thrown down so defiantly."

A letter from William H. Brooks, of Cambridgeport, unconsciously harmonized with Mr. Stearns.

"Feeling that our nation is now in the very throes of her deliverance, and I trust her prompt deliverance, from bondage to her, not Thirty, but Three Hundred Thousand Tyrants, may I frankly say, that, if not inconsistent with your health and safety, which are on no consideration to be perilled, you could aid more than any single person, or score of them, in effectually accomplishing the great triumph. . . . . The unseen forces of public opinion are gathering and forming for the great November conflict. Your long, enforced, and martyr silence will give a depth of impression and moving power and ten thousand echoes to your words beyond their accustomed might."

Something about the menace of violence after this speech, with illustrations of its reception at the time, is postponed to an Appendix.

Kansas was not admitted as a State into the Union until January 29, 1861, after the slaveholding Senators had withdrawn to organize the Rebellion, when the bill on which the present speech was made became a law.

SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT, — Undertaking now, after a silence of more than four years, to address the Senate on this important subject, I should suppress the emotions natural to such an occasion, if I did not declare on the threshold my gratitude to that Supreme Being through whose benign care I am enabled, after much suffering and many changes, once again to resume my duties here, and to speak for the cause so near my heart. To the honored Commonwealth whose representative I am, and also to my immediate associates in this body, with whom I enjoy the fellowship which is found *in thinking alike concerning the Republic*,[1] I owe thanks which I seize the moment to express for indulgence extended to me throughout the protracted seclusion enjoined by medical skill; and I trust that it will not be thought unbecoming in me to put on record here, as an apology for leaving my seat so long vacant, without making way, by resignation, for a successor, that I acted under the illusion of an invalid, whose hopes for restoration to natural health continued against oft-recurring disappointment.

When last I entered into this debate, it became my duty to expose the Crime against Kansas, and to insist

[1] "Eadem de Republica sensisse." — Cic., *Orat. in Pisonem*, c. 32.

upon the immediate admission of that Territory as a State of this Union, with a Constitution forbidding Slavery. Time has passed, but the question remains. Resuming the discussion precisely where I left it, I am happy to avow that rule of moderation which, it is said, may venture to fix the boundaries of wisdom itself. I have no personal griefs to utter: only a vulgar egotism could intrude such into this Chamber. I have no personal wrongs to avenge: only a brutish nature could attempt to wield that vengeance which belongs to the Lord. The years that have intervened and the tombs that have opened[1] since I spoke have their voices, too, which I cannot fail to hear. Besides, what am I, what is any man among the living or among the dead, compared with the question before us? It is this alone which I shall discuss, and I begin the argument with that easy victory which is found in charity.

The Crime against Kansas stands forth in painful light. Search history, and you cannot find its parallel. The slave-trade is bad; but even this enormity is petty, compared with that elaborate contrivance by which, in a Christian age and within the limits of a Republic, all forms of constitutional liberty were perverted, all the rights of human nature violated, and the whole country held trembling on the edge of civil war, — while all this large exuberance of wickedness, detestable in itself, becomes tenfold more detestable, when its origin is traced to the madness for Slavery. The fatal partition between Freedom and Slavery, known as the Missouri Compromise, — the subsequent overthrow of this partition, and the seizure of all by Slavery, — the violation of plighted

[1] Mr. Brooks and Senator Butler were both dead.

faith, — the conspiracy to force Slavery at all hazards into Kansas, — the successive invasions by which all security there was destroyed, and the electoral franchise itself was trodden down, — the sacrilegious seizure of the very polls, and, through pretended forms of law, the imposition of a foreign legislature upon this Territory, — the acts of this legislature, fortifying the Usurpation, and, among other things, establishing test-oaths, calculated to disfranchise actual settlers friendly to Freedom, and securing the privileges of the citizen to actual strangers friendly to Slavery, — the whole crowned by a statute, "the be-all and the end-all" of the whole Usurpation, through which Slavery was not only recognized on this beautiful soil, but made to bristle with a Code of Death such as the world has rarely seen, — all these I fully exposed on a former occasion. And yet the most important part of the argument was at that time left untouched: I mean that found in the Character of Slavery. This natural sequel, with the permission of the Senate, I now propose to supply.

Motive is to Crime as soul to body; and it is only when we comprehend the motive that we can truly comprehend the Crime. Here the motive is found in Slavery and the rage for its extension. Therefore, by logical necessity, must Slavery be discussed, — not indirectly, timidly, and sparingly, but directly, openly, and thoroughly. It must be exhibited as it is, alike in its influence and its animating character, so that not only outside, but inside, may be seen.

This is no time for soft words or excuses. All such are out of place. They may turn away wrath; but what is the wrath of man? This is no time to abandon any advantage in the argument. Senators some-

times announce that they resist Slavery on political grounds only, and remind us that they say nothing of the moral question. This is wrong. Slavery must be resisted not only on political grounds, but on all other grounds, whether social, economical, or moral. Ours is no holiday contest; nor is it any strife of rival factions, of White and Red Roses, of theatric Neri and Bianchi; but it is a solemn battle between Right and Wrong, between Good and Evil. Such a battle cannot be fought with rosewater. There is austere work to be done, and Freedom cannot consent to fling away any of her weapons.

If I were disposed to shrink from this discussion, the boundless assumptions made by Senators on the other side would not allow me. The whole character of Slavery, as a pretended form of Civilization, is put directly in issue, with a pertinacity and a hardihood which banish all reserve on this side. In these assumptions Senators from South Carolina naturally take the lead. Following Mr. Calhoun, who pronounced Slavery "the most solid and durable foundation on which to rear free and stable political institutions,"[1] and Mr. McDuffie, who did not shrink from calling it "the corner-stone of our republican edifice,"[2] the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMMOND] insists that its "frame of society is the best in the world"[3]; and his colleague [Mr. CHESNUT] takes up the strain. One Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS], adds, that Slavery

[1] Speech in the Senate, February 6, 1837: Works, Vol. II. p. 632. See Miscellaneous Writings on Slavery, by William Jay, p. 509.

[2] Message to the Legislature of South Carolina, November, 1835.

[3] Speech in the Senate, March 4, 1858: Congressional Globe, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 961.

"is but a form of civil government for those who by their nature are not fit to govern themselves";[1] and his colleague [Mr. BROWN] openly vaunts that it "is a great moral, social, and political blessing, — a blessing to the slave, and a blessing to the master."[2] One Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTER], in a studied vindication of what he is pleased to call "the social system of the South," exalts Slavery as "the normal condition of human society," "beneficial to the non-slave-owner as it is to the slave-owner," "best for the happiness of both races," — and, in enthusiastic advocacy, declares, "that the very keystone of the mighty arch, which, by its concentrated strength, and by the mutual support of its parts, is able to sustain our social superstructure, consists in the black marble block of African Slavery: knock that out, and the mighty fabric, with all that it upholds, topples and tumbles to its fall."[3] These are his very words, uttered in debate here. And his colleague [Mr. MASON], who never hesitates where Slavery is in question, proclaims that it is "*ennobling* to both races, the white and the black," — a word which, so far as the slave is concerned, he changes, on a subsequent day, to "elevating," assuming still that it is "ennobling" to the whites,[4] — which is simply a new version of the old assumption, by Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, that "the institution of Domestic Slavery supersedes the necessity of an order of nobility."[5]

[1] Speech in the Senate, February 29, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 917.

[2] Speech in the Senate, March 6, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 1004.

[3] Speech in the Senate, January 31, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, pp. 104 - 109.

[4] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., pp. 557, 596: January 23, 26, 1860

[5] Message to the Legislature of South Carolina, November, 1835.

Thus, by various voices, is Slavery defiantly proclaimed a form of Civilization, — not seeing that its existence is plainly inconsistent with the first principles of anything that can be called Civilization, except by that figure of speech in classical literature where a thing takes its name from something which it has not, as the dreadful Fates were called merciful because they were without mercy. Pardon the allusion, if I add, that, listening to these sounding words for Slavery, I am reminded of the kindred extravagance related by that remarkable traveller in China, the late Abbé Huc, where a gloomy hole in which he was lodged, infested by mosquitoes and exhaling noisome vapors, with light and air entering by a single narrow aperture only, was styled by Chinese pride "The Hotel of the Beatitudes." According to a Hindoo proverb, the snail sees nothing but its own shell, and thinks it the grandest palace in the universe. This is another illustration of the delusion which we are called to witness.

It is natural that Senators thus insensible to the true character of Slavery should evince an equal insensibility to the true character of the Constitution. This is shown in the claim now made, and pressed with unprecedented energy, degrading the work of our fathers, that by virtue of the Constitution the pretended property in man is placed beyond the reach of Congressional prohibition even within Congressional jurisdiction, so that the slave-master may at all times enter the broad outlying territories of the Union with the victims of his oppression, and there continue to hold them by lash and chain.

Such are two assumptions, the first of fact, and the second of Constitutional Law, now vaunted without

apology or hesitation. I meet them both. To the first I oppose the essential Barbarism of Slavery, in all its influences, whether high or low, — as Satan is Satan still, whether towering in the sky or squatting in the toad. To the second I oppose the unanswerable, irresistible truth, that the Constitution of the United States nowhere recognizes property in man. These two assumptions naturally go together. They are "twins" suckled by the same wolf. They are the "couple" in the present slave-hunt. And the latter cannot be answered without exposing the former. It is only when Slavery is exhibited in its truly hateful character that we fully appreciate the absurdity of the assumption, which, in defiance of express letter in the Constitution, and without a single sentence, phrase, or word upholding human bondage, yet foists into this blameless text the barbarous idea that man can hold property in man.

On former occasions I have discussed Slavery only incidentally: as, in unfolding the principle that Slavery is Sectional and Freedom National; in exposing the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Bill; in vindicating the Prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory; in exhibiting the imbecility, throughout the Revolution, of the Slave States, and especially of South Carolina; and, lastly, in unmasking the Crime against Kansas. On all these occasions, where I spoke at length, I said too little of the character of Slavery, — partly because other topics were presented, and partly from a prevailing disinclination to press the argument against those whom I knew to have all the sensitiveness of a sick man. But, God be praised, this time has passed, and the debate is now lifted from details to principles. Grander debate has not occurred in our

history, — rarely in any history; nor can it close or subside, except with the triumph of Freedom.

First Assumption.

Of course I begin with the assumption of fact, which must be treated at length.

It was the often-quoted remark of John Wesley, who knew well how to use words, as also how to touch hearts, that Slavery is "the sum of all villanies." The phrase is pungent; but it were rash in any of us to criticise the testimony of that illustrious founder of Methodism, whose ample experience of Slavery in Georgia and the Carolinas seems to have been all condensed in this sententious judgment. Language is feeble to express all the enormity of an institution which is now exalted as in itself a form of civilization, "ennobling" at least to the master, if not to the slave. Look at it as you will, and it is always the scab, the canker, the "barebones," and the shame of the country, — wrong, not merely in the abstract, as is often admitted by its apologist, but wrong in the concrete also, and possessing no single element of right. Look at it in the light of principle, and it is nothing less than a huge insurrection against the eternal law of God, involving in its pretensions the denial of all human rights, and also the denial of that Divine Law in which God himself is manifest, thus being practically the grossest lie and the grossest atheism. Founded in violence, sustained only by violence, such a wrong must by sure law of compensation blast master as well as slave, — blast the lands on which they live, blast the community of which they are part, blast the govern-

ment which does not forbid the outrage; and the longer it exists and the more completely it prevails, must its vengeful influences penetrate the whole social system. Barbarous in origin, barbarous in law, barbarous in all its pretensions, barbarous in the instruments it employs, barbarous in consequences, barbarous in spirit, barbarous wherever it shows itself, Slavery must breed Barbarians, while it develops everywhere, alike in the individual and the society to which he belongs, the essential elements of Barbarism. In this character it is conspicuous before the world.

Undertaking now to expose the BARBARISM OF SLAVERY, the whole broad field is open before me. There is nothing in its character, its manifold wrong, its wretched results, and especially in its influence on the class claiming to be "ennobled" by it, that will not fall naturally under consideration.

I know well the difficulty of this discussion, involved in the humiliating truth with which I begin. Senators, on former occasions, revealing their sensitiveness, have even protested against comparison between what were called "two civilizations," — meaning the two social systems produced respectively by Freedom and Slavery. The sensibility and the protest are not unnatural, though mistaken. "Two civilizations!" Sir, in this nineteenth century of Christian light there can be but one Civilization, and this is where Freedom prevails. Between Slavery and Civilization there is essential incompatibility. If you are for the one, you cannot be for the other; and just in proportion to the embrace of Slavery is the divorce from Civilization. As cold is but the absence of heat, and darkness but the absence of light, so is Slavery but the absence of

justice and humanity, without which Civilization is impossible. That slave-masters should be disturbed, when this is exposed, might be expected. But the assumptions so boastfully made, while they may not prevent the sensibility, yet surely exclude all ground of protest, when these assumptions are exposed.

Nor is this the only difficulty. Slavery is a bloody Touch-Me-Not, and everywhere in sight now blooms the bloody flower. It is on the wayside as we approach the National Capitol; it is on the marble steps which we mount; it flaunts on this floor. I stand now in the house of its friends. About me, while I speak, are its most jealous guardians, who have shown in the past how much they are ready to do or not to do, where Slavery is in question. Menaces to deter me have not been spared. But I should ill deserve the high post of duty here, with which I am honored by a generous and enlightened people, if I could hesitate. Idolatry has been exposed in the presence of idolaters, and hypocrisy chastised in the presence of Scribes and Pharisees. Such examples may impart encouragement to a Senator undertaking in this presence to expose Slavery; nor can any language, directly responsive to Senatorial assumptions made for this Barbarism, be open to question. Slavery can be painted only in sternest colors; nor can I forget that Nature's sternest painter has been called the best.

THE BARBARISM OF SLAVERY appears, *first*, in the *character of Slavery*, and, *secondly*, in the *character of Slave-Masters*.

Under the first head we shall properly consider (1) the Law of Slavery with its Origin, and (2) the prac-

tical results of Slavery, as shown in comparison between the Free States and the Slave States.

Under the *second* head we shall naturally consider (1) Slave-Masters as shown in the Law of Slavery; (2) Slave-Masters in their relations with slaves, here glancing at their three brutal instruments; (3) Slave-Masters in their relations with each other, with society, and with Government; and (4) Slave-Masters in their unconsciousness.

The way will then be prepared for the consideration of the assumption of Constitutional Law.

I.

IN presenting the CHARACTER OF SLAVERY, there is little for me, except to make Slavery paint itself. When this is done, the picture will need no explanatory words.

(1.) I begin with the *Law of Slavery and its Origin;* and here this Barbarism sketches itself in its own chosen definition. It is simply this: Man, created in the image of God, is divested of the human character, and declared to be a "chattel," — that is, a beast, a thing, or article of property. That this statement may not seem made without precise authority, I quote the statutes of three different States, beginning with South Carolina, whose voice for Slavery has always unerring distinctiveness. According to the definition supplied by this State, slaves

"shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators, and as-

signs, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." [1]

And here is the definition supplied by the Civil Code of Louisiana: —

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master." [2]

In similar spirit the law of Maryland thus indirectly defines a slave as an *article*: —

"In case the personal property of a ward shall consist of specific *articles, such as slaves*, working beasts, animals of any kind, ... the court, if it shall deem it advantageous for the ward, may at any time pass an order for the sale thereof." [3]

Not to occupy time unnecessarily, I present a summary of the pretended law defining Slavery in all the Slave States, as made by a careful writer, Judge Stroud, in a work of juridical as well as philanthropic merit: —

"The cardinal principle of Slavery — that the slave is not to be ranked among *sentient* beings, but among *things*, is an article of property, a chattel personal — obtains as undoubted law in all of these [Slave] States." [4]

Out of this definition, as from a solitary germ, which in its pettiness might be crushed by the hand, towers our Upas Tree and all its gigantic poison. Study it, and you will comprehend the whole monstrous growth.

Sir, look at its plain import, and see the relation which it establishes. The slave is held simply *for the*

[1] Statutes at Large of South Carolina, Vol. VII. p. 397, Act No. 670, sec. 1.
[2] Civil Code, Art. 35.
[3] Laws of Maryland, Acts of 1798, Ch. CI. xii. 12.
[4] Stroud, Law relating to Slavery, pp. 22, 23.

use of his master, to whose behests his life, liberty, and happiness are devoted, and by whom he may be bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, invoiced, shipped as cargo, stored as goods, sold on execution, knocked off at public auction, and even staked at the gaming-table on the hazard of a card or a die, — all according to law. Nor is there anything, within the limit of life, inflicted on a beast, which may not be inflicted on the slave. He may be marked like a hog, branded like a mule, yoked like an ox, hobbled like a horse, driven like an ass, sheared like a sheep, maimed like a cur, and constantly beaten like a brute, — all according to law. And should life itself be taken, what is the remedy? The Law of Slavery, imitating that rule of evidence which in barbarous days and barbarous countries prevented the Christian from testifying against the Mahometan, openly pronounces the incompetency of the whole African race, whether bond or free, to testify against a white man in any case, and thus, after surrendering the slave to all possible outrage, crowns its tyranny by excluding the very testimony through which the bloody cruelty of the Slave-Master might be exposed.

Thus in its Law does Slavery paint itself; but it is only when we look at details, and detect its essential elements, *five in number*, all inspired by *a single motive*, that its character becomes completely manifest.

Foremost, of course, in these elements, is the impossible pretension, where Barbarism is lost in impiety, by which man claims *property in man*. Against such blasphemy the argument is brief. According to the Law of Nature, written by the same hand that placed the planets in their orbits, and, like them, constituting part of the eternal system of the Universe, every human being

has complete title to himself direct from the Almighty. Naked he is born; but this birthright is inseparable from the human form. A man may be poor in this world's goods; but he owns himself. No war or robbery, ancient or recent, — no capture — no middle passage, — no change of clime, — no purchase-money, — no transmission from hand to hand, no matter how many times, and no matter at what price, can defeat this indefeasible, God-given franchise. And a divine mandate, strong as that which guards Life, guards Liberty also. Even at the very morning of Creation, when God said, "Let there be Light," — earlier than the malediction against murder, — he set the everlasting difference between man and chattel, giving to man "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

> "That right we hold
> By his donation; but man over men
> He made not lord: such title to himself
> Reserving, human left from human free."[1]

Slavery tyrannically assumes power which Heaven denied, — while, under its barbarous necromancy, borrowed from the Source of Evil, a man is changed into a chattel, a person is withered into a thing, a soul is shrunk into merchandise. Say, Sir, in lofty madness, that you own the sun, the stars, the moon; but do not say that you own a man, endowed with soul to live immortal, when sun and moon and stars have passed away.

Secondly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of marriage*, recognized as a sacrament by the Church, and as a contract by the civil power, wher-

[1] Milton, Paradise Lost, Book XII, 68-71.

ever civilization prevails. Under the Law of Slavery no such sacrament is respected, and no such contract can exist. The ties formed between slaves are all subject to the selfish interests or more selfish lust of the master, whose license knows no check. Natural affections which have come together are rudely torn asunder: nor is this all. Stripped of every defence, the chastity of a whole race is exposed to violence, while the result is recorded in tell-tale faces of children, glowing with a master's blood, but doomed for their mother's skin to Slavery through descending generations. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN], galled by the comparison between Slavery and Polygamy, winces. I hail this sensibility as the sign of virtue. Let him reflect, and he will confess that there are many disgusting elements in Slavery, not present in Polygamy, while the single disgusting element of Polygamy is more than present in Slavery. By license of Polygamy, one man may have many wives, all bound to him by marriage-tie, and in other respects protected by law. By license of Slavery, a whole race is delivered over to prostitution and concubinage, without the protection of any law. Surely, Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Thirdly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of the parental relation*, provided by God in his benevolence for the nurture and education of the human family, and constituting an essential part of Civilization itself. And yet by the Law of Slavery — happily beginning to be modified in some places — this relation is set at nought, and in its place is substituted the arbitrary control of the master, at whose mere command little children, such as the Saviour called unto

him, though clasped by a mother's arms, are swept under the hammer of the auctioneer. I do not dwell on this exhibition. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Fourthly. Slavery paints itself again *in closing the gates of knowledge,* which are also the shining gates of Civilization. Under its plain, unequivocal law, the bondman, at the unrestrained will of his master, is shut out from all instruction; while in many places — incredible to relate — the law itself, by cumulative provisions, positively forbids that he shall be taught to read! Of course the slave cannot be allowed to read: for his soul would then expand in larger air, while he saw the glory of the North Star, and also the helping truth, that God, who made iron, never made a slave; for he would then become familiar with the Scriptures, with the Decalogue still speaking in the thunders of Sinai, — with that ancient text, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death"[1] — with that other text, "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal,"[2] — with that great story of Redemption, when the Lord raised the slave-born Moses to deliver his chosen people from the house of bondage, — and with that sublimer story, where the Saviour died a cruel death, that all men, without distinction of race, might be saved, leaving to mankind a commandment which, even without his example, makes Slavery impossible. Thus, in order to fasten your manacles upon the slave, you fasten other manacles upon his soul. The ancients maintained Slavery by chains and death: you maintain it by that infinite despotism and monopoly through which human nature itself is degraded. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

[1] Exodus, xxi. 16. [2] Colossians, iv. 1.

Fifthly. Slavery paints itself again *in the appropriation of all the toil* of its victims, excluding them from that property in their own earnings which the Law of Nature allows and Civilization secures. The painful injustice of this pretension is lost in its meanness. It is robbery and petty larceny under garb of law. And even the meanness is lost in the absurdity of its associate pretension, that the African, thus despoiled of all earnings, is saved from poverty, and that for his own good he must work for his master, and not for himself. Alas, by such fallacy is a whole race pauperized! And yet this transaction is not without illustrative example. A sombre poet, whose verse has found wide favor, pictures a creature who

> "with one hand put
> A penny in the urn of poverty,
> And with the other took a shilling out." [1]

And a celebrated traveller through Russia, more than a generation ago, describes a kindred spirit, who, while devoutly crossing himself at church with his right hand, with the left deliberately picked the pocket of a fellow-sinner by his side.[2] Not admiring these instances, I cannot cease to deplore a system which has much of both, while, under affectation of charity, it sordidly takes from the slave all the fruits of his bitter sweat, and thus takes from him the main spring to exertion. Tell me, Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Such is Slavery in its five special elements of Barbarism, as recognized by law: first, assuming that man can hold property in man; secondly, abrogating the relation

[1] Pollok, Course of Time, Book VIII. 632–634.

[2] Clarke, E. D., Travels in Europe, Asia, and Africa, (London, 1816,) Vol. I. pp. 72, 73.

of husband and wife; thirdly, abrogating the parental tie; fourthly, closing the gates of knowledge; and, fifthly, appropriating the unpaid labor of another. Take away these elements, sometimes called "abuses," and Slavery will cease to exist; for it is these very "abuses" which constitute Slavery. Take away any one of them, and the abolition of Slavery begins. And when I present Slavery for judgment, I mean no slight evil, with regard to which there may be reasonable difference of opinion, but I mean this fivefold embodiment of "abuse," this ghastly quincunx of Barbarism, each particular of which, if considered separately, must be denounced at once with all the ardor of an honest soul, while the whole fivefold combination must awake a fivefold denunciation. The historic pirates, once the plague of the Gulf whose waters they plundered, have been praised for the equity with which they adjusted the ratable shares of spoil, and also for generous benefactions to the poor, and even to churches, so that Sir Walter Scott could say, —

"Do thou revere
The statutes of the Buccaneer."[1]

In our Law of Slavery what is there to revere? what is there at which the soul does not rise in abhorrence?

But this fivefold combination becomes yet more hateful when its *single motive* is considered; and here Slavery paints itself finally. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS] says that it is "but a form of civil government for those who by their nature are not fit to govern themselves." The Senator is mistaken. It is an outrage, where five different pretensions all concur in one single object, looking only to the profit

[1] Rokeby, Canto I. st. 21.

of the master, and constituting its ever-present motive power, which is simply *to compel the labor of fellow-men without wages.* If I pronounce this object not only barbarous, but brutal, I follow the judgment of Luther's Bible, in the book "Jesus Sirach," known in our translation as Ecclesiasticus, where it is said: "He that giveth not his wages to the laborer, *he is a bloodhound.*"[1]

Slavery is often exposed as degrading Humanity. On this fruitful theme nobody has expressed himself with the force and beautiful eloquence of our own Channing. His generous soul glowed with indignation at the thought of man, supremest creature of earth, and first of God's works, despoiled of manhood and changed to a thing. But earlier than Channing was Jean Jacques Rousseau, who, with similar eloquence and the same glowing indignation, vindicated Humanity. How grandly he insists that nobody can consent to be a slave, or can be born a slave! Believing Liberty the most noble of human attributes, this wonderful writer will not stop to consider if descent to the condition of beasts be not to degrade human nature, if renunciation of the most precious of all God's gifts be not to offend the Author of our being; but he demands only by what right those who degrade themselves to this depth can subject their posterity to this same ignominy, renouncing for them goods which do not depend upon any ancestors, and without which life itself is to all

[1] "*Wer dem Arbeiter seinen Lohn nicht gibt der ist ein Bluthund.*" (Cap. xxxv. 27.) Our less energetic version pictures the same enormity: "The bread of the needy is their life: he that defraudeth him thereof is a man of blood." (Ecclesiasticus, xxxiv. 21.) The prophet Jeremiah unites in this judgment: "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service *without wages*, and giveth him not for his work." Chap. xxii. 13.

worthy of it a burden; and he justly concludes, that, as, to establish Slavery, it is necessary to violate Nature, so, to perpetuate this claim, it is necessary to change Nature. His final judgment, being the practical conclusion of this outburst, holds up jurisconsults, gravely pronouncing that the child of a slave is born a slave, as deciding, in other terms, that a man is not born a man,[1] — thus exposing the peculiar absurdity of that pretension by which Slavery is transmitted from the mother to her offspring, as expressed in the Latin scrap on which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] relies: *Partus sequitur ventrem.*

If the offence of Slavery were less extended, if it were confined to some narrow region, if it had less of grandeur in its proportions, if its victims were counted by tens and hundreds instead of millions, the five-headed enormity would find little indulgence; all would rise against it, while Religion and Civilization would lavish choicest efforts in the general warfare. But what is wrong when done to one man cannot be right when done to many. If it is wrong thus to degrade a single soul, if it is wrong thus to degrade you, Mr. President, it cannot be right to degrade a whole race. And yet this is denied by the barbarous logic of Slavery, which, taking advantage of its own wrong, claims immunity because its usurpation has assumed a front of audacity that cannot be safely attacked. Unhappily, there is Barbarism elsewhere in the world; but American Slavery, as defined by existing law, stands forth as the greatest organized Barbarism on which the sun now looks. It is without a single peer. Its author, after making it, broke the die.

[1] Discours sur l'Origine de l'Inégalité parmi les Hommes, 2nde Partie: Œuvres, Tom. IV. p. 179.

If curiosity carries us to the origin of this law, — and here I approach a topic often considered in this Chamber, — we shall again confess its Barbarism. It is not derived from the Common Law, that fountain of Liberty; for this law, while unhappily recognizing a system of servitude known as villeinage, secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave, — guarded his person against mayhem, — protected his wife against rape, — gave to his marriage equal validity with the marriage of his master, — and surrounded his offspring with generous presumptions of Freedom, unlike that rule of yours by which the servitude of the mother is necessarily stamped upon the child. It is not derived from the Roman Law, that fountain of Tyranny, for two reasons: first, because this law, in its better days, when its early rigors were spent, like the Common Law itself, secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave, — in certain cases of cruelty rescued him from his master, prevented separation of parents and children, also of brothers and sisters, and even protected him in the marriage relation; and, secondly, because the Thirteen Colonies were not derived from any of those countries which recognized the Roman Law, while this law, even before the discovery of this continent, had lost all living efficacy. It is not derived from the Mohammedan Law; for, under the mild injunctions of the Koran, a benignant servitude, unlike yours, has prevailed, — where the lash is not allowed to lacerate the back of a female, — where no knife or branding-iron is employed upon any human being, to mark him as the property of his fellow-man, — where the master is expressly enjoined to favor the desires of his slave for emancipation, — and where the blood of

the master, mingling with that of his bondwoman, takes from her the transferable character of chattel, and confers complete freedom upon their offspring. It is not derived from the Spanish Law; for this law contains humane elements unknown to your system, borrowed, perhaps, from Mohammedan Moors who so long occupied Spain; and, besides, our Thirteen Colonies had no umbilical connection with Spain. Nor is it derived from English statutes or American statutes; for we have the positive and repeated averment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], and also of other Senators, that in not a single State of the Union can any such statutes establishing Slavery be found. From none of these does it come.

No, Sir, not from any land of Civilization is this Barbarism derived. It comes from Africa, ancient nurse of monsters, — from Guinea, Dahomey, and Congo. There is its origin and fountain. This benighted region, we are told by Chief-Justice Marshall in a memorable judgment,[1] still asserts a right, discarded by Christendom, to enslave captives taken in war; and this African Barbarism is the beginning of American Slavery. The Supreme Court of Georgia, a Slave State, has not shrunk from this conclusion. "Licensed to hold slave property," says the Court, "the Georgia planter held the slave as a chattel, either directly from the slave-trader or from those who held under him, and he from the slave-captor in Africa. The property of the planter in the slave became thus the property of the original captor."[2] It is natural that a right thus derived in defiance of Christendom, and openly founded on the

[1] The Antelope, 10 Wheaton, 66.

[2] Neal *v.* Farmer, 9 Georgia Reports, 580.

most vulgar Paganism, should be exercised without mitigating influence from Christianity, — that the master's authority over the person of his slave, over his conjugal relations, over his parental relations, over the employment of his time, over all his acquisitions, should be recognized, while no generous presumption inclines to Freedom, and the womb of the bondwoman can deliver only a slave.

From its home in Africa, where it is sustained by immemorial usage, this Barbarism, thus derived and thus developed, traversed the ocean to American soil. It entered on board that fatal slave-ship,

> "Built in the eclipse, and rigged with curses dark,"

which in 1620 landed its cruel cargo at Jamestown, in Virginia; and it has boldly taken its place in every succeeding slave-ship, from that early day till now, — helping to pack the human freight, regardless of human agony, — surviving the torments of the middle passage, — surviving its countless victims plunged beneath the waves; and it has left the slave-ship only to travel inseparable from the slave in his various doom, sanctioning by its barbarous code every outrage, whether of mayhem or robbery, lash or lust, and fastening itself upon his offspring to the remotest generation. Thus are barbarous prerogatives of barbarous half-naked African chiefs perpetuated in American Slave-Masters, while the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], perhaps unconscious of their origin, perhaps desirous to secure for them the appearance of a less barbarous pedigree, tricks them out with a phrase of the Roman Law, discarded by the Common Law, which simply renders into ancient Latin an existing rule of African Barbarism, recognized as an existing rule of American Slavery.

Such is the plain juridical origin of the American slave code, now vaunted as a badge of Civilization. But all law, whatever its juridical origin, whether Christian or Mohammedan, Roman or African, may be traced to other and ampler influences in Nature, sometimes of Right and sometimes of Wrong. Surely the law which stamped the slave-trade as piracy punishable with death had a different inspiration from that other law which secured immunity for the slave-trade throughout an immense territory, and invested its supporters with political power. As there is a nobler law above, so there is a meaner law below, and each is felt in human affairs.

Thus far we have seen Slavery only in pretended law, and in the origin of that law. Here I might stop, without proceeding in the argument; for on the letter of the law alone must Slavery be condemned. But the tree is known by its fruits, which I shall now exhibit: and this brings me to the second stage of the argument.

(2.) In considering *the practical results of Slavery*, the materials are so obvious and diversified that my chief care will be to abridge and reject: and here I put the Slave States and Free States face to face, showing at each point the blasting influence of Slavery.

Before proceeding with these details, I would for one moment expose that degradation of free labor, which is one of the general results. Where there are slaves, whose office is work, it is held disreputable for a white man to soil his skin or harden his hands with honest toil. The Slave-Master of course declines work, and his pernicious example infects all others. With impi-

ous resolve, they would reverse the Almighty decree appointing labor as the duty of man, and declaring that in the sweat of his face shall he eat his bread. The Slave-Master says, "No! this is true of the slave, of the black man, but not of the white man: he shall not eat his bread in the sweat of his face." Thus is the brand of degradation stamped upon that daily toil which contributes so much to a true Civilization. It is a constant boast in the Slave States, that white men there will not perform work performed in the Free States. Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Waddy Thompson made this boast. Let it be borne in mind, then, that, where Slavery prevails, there is not only despair for the black man, but inequality and ignominy for the white laborer. By necessary consequence, the latter, whether emigrating from our Free States or fleeing from oppression and wretchedness in his European home, avoids a region disabled by such a social law. Hence a twofold injustice: practically he is excluded from the land, while the land itself becomes a prey to that paralysis which is caused by a violation of the laws of God. And now for the testimony.

The States where this Barbarism exists excel the Free States in all natural advantages. Their territory is more extensive, stretching over 851,448 square miles, while the Free States, including California, embrace only 612,597 square miles. Here is a difference of more than 238,000 square miles in favor of the Slave States, showing that Freedom starts in this great rivalry with a field more than a quarter less than that of Slavery. In happiness of climate, adapted to productions of special value, — in exhaustless motive power distributed throughout its space, — in natural

SOUTHBRIDGE
PUBLIC LIBRARY

highways, by more than fifty navigable rivers, never closed by the rigors of winter, — and in a stretch of coast, along Ocean and Gulf, indented by hospitable harbors, — the whole presenting incomparable advantages for that true Civilization, where agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, both domestic and foreign, blend, — in all these respects the Slave States excel the Free States, whose climate is often churlish, whose motive power is less various, whose navigable rivers are fewer and often sealed by ice, and whose coast, while less in extent and with fewer harbors, is often perilous from storm and cold.

But Slavery plays the part of a Harpy, and defiles the choicest banquet. See what it does with this territory, thus spacious and fair.

An important indication of prosperity is in the growth of *population.* In this respect the two regions started equal. In 1790, at the first census under the Constitution, the population of the present Slave States was 1,961,372, of the present Free States 1,968,455, showing a difference of only 7,083 in favor of the Free States. This difference, at first merely nominal, has been constantly increasing since, showing itself more strongly in each decennial census, until, in 1850, the population of the Slave States, swollen by the annexation of three foreign Territories, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, was only 9,612,969, while that of the Free States, without such large annexations, reached 13,434,922, showing a difference of 3,821,953 in favor of Freedom. But this difference becomes still more remarkable, if we confine our inquiries to the white population, which at this period was only 6,184,477 in the Slave States, while it was 13,238,670 in the Free States, showing a difference

of 7,054,193, in favor of Freedom, and showing also that the white population of the Free States had not only doubled, but, while occupying a smaller territory, commenced to triple, that of the Slave States. The comparative sparseness of the two populations furnishes another illustration. In the Slave States the average number of inhabitants to a square mile was 11.29, while in the Free States it was 21.93, or almost two to one in favor of Freedom.

These results are general; but if we take any particular Slave State, and compare it with a Free State, we shall find the same marked evidence for Freedom. Take Virginia, with a territory of 61,352 miles, and New York, with a territory of 47,000, or over 14,000 square miles less than her sister State. New York has one seaport, Virginia some three or four; New York has one noble river, Virginia has several; New York for 400 miles runs along the frozen line of Canada, Virginia basks in a climate of constant felicity. But Freedom is better than climate, river, or seaport. In 1790 the population of Virginia was 748,308, and in 1850 it was 1,421,661. In 1790 the population of New York was 340,120, and in 1850 it was 3,097,394. That of Virginia had not doubled in sixty years, while that of New York had multiplied more than nine-fold. A similar comparison may be made between Kentucky, with 37,680 square miles, admitted into the Union as long ago as 1792, and Ohio, with 39,964 square miles, admitted into the Union in 1802. In 1850, the Slave State had a population of only 982,405, while Ohio had a population of 1,980,329, showing a difference of nearly a million in favor of Freedom.

As in population, so also in *the value of property, real*

and personal, do the Free States excel the Slave States. According to the census of 1850, the value of property in the Free States was $4,102,162,098, while in the Slave States it was $2,936,090,737; or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh, only $1,655,945,137, — showing an enormous difference of billions in favor of Freedom. In the Free States the valuation per acre was $10.46, in the Slave States only $3.04. This disproportion was still greater in 1855, when, according to the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, the valuation of the Free States was $5,770,197,679, or $14.71 per acre; and of the Slave States, $3,977,354,046, or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh, $2,505,186,446, or $4.59 per acre. Thus in five years from 1850 the valuation of property in the Free States received an increase of more than the whole accumulated valuation of the Slave States in 1850.

Looking at details, we find the same disproportions. Arkansas and Michigan, nearly equal in territory, were organized as States by simultaneous Acts of Congress; and yet in 1855 the whole valuation of Arkansas, including its asserted property in human flesh, was only $64,240,726, while that of Michigan, without a single slave, was $116,593,580. The whole accumulated valuation of all the Slave States, deducting the asserted property in human flesh, in 1850, was only $1,655,945,137; but the valuation of New York alone, in 1855, reached the nearly equal sum of $1,401,285,279. The valuation of Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Texas, all together, in 1850, deducting human flesh, was $559,224,920, or simply $1.96 per acre, — being less than that of Massachusetts alone, which was $573,342,286, or $114.85 per acre.

The Slave States boast of *agriculture;* but here again, notwithstanding superior natural advantages, they must yield to the Free States at every point, — in the number of farms and plantations, in the number of acres improved, in the cash value of farms, in the average value per acre, and in the value of farming implements and machinery. Here is a short table.

	Free States.	Slave States.
Number of farms, . . .	873,608	569,201
Acres of improved land, . .	57,720,494	54,970,327
Cash value of farms, . .	$2,147,218,478	$1,117,649,649
Average value per acre, . .	$19.17	$6.18
Value of farming implements,	$85,840,141	$65,345,625

Such is the mighty contrast. But it does not stop here. Careful tables place the agricultural products of the Free States, for the year ending June, 1850, at $888,634,334, while those of the Slave States were $631,277,417; the product per acre in the Free States at $7.94, and the product per acre in the Slave States at $3.49; the average product of each agriculturist in the Free States at $342, and in the Slave States at $171. Thus the Free States, with a smaller population engaged in agriculture than the Slave States, and with smaller territory, show an annual sum total of agricultural products surpassing those of the Slave States by two hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars, while twice as much is produced by each agriculturist, and more than twice as much is produced on an acre. The monopoly of cotton, rice, and cane-sugar, with a climate granting two and sometimes three crops in the year, is thus impotent in competition with Freedom.

In *manufactures, mining, and the mechanic arts* the failure of the Slave States is greater still. It appears

at all points, — in the capital employed, in the value of the raw material, in the annual wages, and in the annual product. A short table will show the contrast.

	Free States.	Slave States.
Capital, ...	$ 430,240,051	$ 95,029,877
Value of raw material, . .	465,844,092	86,190,639
Annual wages, . . .	195,436,453	33,247,560
Annual product, . . .	842,586,058	165,423,027

This might be illustrated by details with regard to different manufactures, — as shoes, cotton, woollens, pig iron, wrought iron, and iron castings, — all showing the contrast. It might also be illustrated by comparison between different States, — showing, for instance, that the manufactures of Massachusetts, during the last year, exceeded those of all the Slave States combined.

In *commerce* the failure of the Slave States is on a yet larger scale. Under this head the census does not supply proper statistics, and we are left to approximations from other sources; but these are enough for our purpose. It appears, that, of products which enter into commerce, the Free States had an amount valued at $ 1,377,199,968, the Slave States an amount valued only at $ 410,754,992; that, of persons engaged in trade, the Free States had 136,856, and the Slave States 52,622; and that, of tonnage employed, the Free States had 2,791,096 tons, and the Slave States only 726,284. This was in 1850. But in 1855 the disproportion was still greater, the Free States having 4,320,768 tons, and the Slave States 855,510 tons, being a difference of five to one, — and the tonnage of Massachusetts alone being 979,210 tons, an amount larger than that of all the Slave States together. The tonnage built during this year by the Free States was 528,844 tons, by the

Slave States 52,938 tons. Maine alone built 215,905 tons, or more than four times the whole built in the Slave States.

The foreign commerce of the Free States, in 1855, as indicated by exports and imports, was $404,365,503; of the Slave States, $132,062,196. The exports of the Free States were $167,520,693; of the Slave States, including the vaunted cotton crop, $107,475,668. The imports of the Free States were $236,844,810; of the Slave States, $24,586,528. The foreign commerce of New York alone was more than twice as large as that of all the Slave States; her imports were larger, and her exports were larger also. Add to this evidence of figures the testimony of a Virginian, Mr. Loudon, in a letter written just before the sitting of a Southern Commercial Convention. Thus he complains and testifies: —

"There are not half a dozen vessels engaged in our own trade that are owned in Virginia; and I have been unable to find a vessel at Liverpool loading for Virginia within three years, during the height of our busy season."

Railroads and canals are the avenues of commerce; and here again the Free States excel. Of railroads in operation in 1854, there were 13,105 miles in the Free States, and 4,212 in the Slave States. Of canals there were 3,682 miles in the Free States, and 1,116 in the Slave States.

The *Post-Office*, which is the agent not only of commerce, but of civilization, joins in the uniform testimony. According to the tables for 1859, the postage collected in the Free States was $5,581,749, and the expense of carrying the mails $6,945,545, leaving a deficit of

$1,363,736. In the Slave States the amount collected was only $1,936,167, and the expense of carrying the mails $5,947,076, leaving the enormous deficit of $4,010,909, — the difference between the two deficits being $2,647,113. The Slave States did not pay one third of the expense in transporting their own mails; and not a single Slave State paid for transporting its own mails, not even the small State of Delaware. Massachusetts, besides paying for hers, had a surplus larger by one half than the whole amount collected in South Carolina.

According to the census of 1850, the value of *churches* in the Free States was $66,177,586; in the Slave States, $20,683,265.

The *voluntary charity* contributed in 1855, for certain leading purposes of Christian benevolence, was, in the Free States, $955,511; for the same purposes in the Slave States, $193,885. For the Bible cause the Free States contributed $321,365; the Slave States, $67,226. For the Missionary cause the former contributed $502,174; and the latter, $101,934. For the Tract Society the former contributed $131,972; and the latter, $24,725. The amount contributed for Missions by Massachusetts was greater than that contributed by all the Slave States, and more than eight times that contributed by South Carolina.

Nor have the Free States been backward in charity for the benefit of the Slave States. The records of Massachusetts show that as long ago as 1781, at the beginning of the Government, there was a contribution throughout the Commonwealth, under the particular direction of that eminent patriot, Samuel Adams, for the relief of inhabitants of South Carolina and Georgia [1]

[1] Wells, Life of Samuel Adams, Vol. III. pp. 138, 139.

In 1855 we were saddened by the prevalence of yellow fever in Portsmouth, Virginia; and now, from a report of the Relief Committee of that place, we learn that the amount of charity contributed by the Slave States, exclusive of Virginia, the afflicted State, was $12,182; and including Virginia, it was $33,398; while $42,547 was contributed by the Free States.

In all this array we see the fatal influence of Slavery. But its Barbarism is yet more conspicuous, when we consider its *Educational Establishments*, and the unhappy results naturally ensuing from their imperfect character.

Of *colleges*, in 1856, the Free States had 61, and the Slave States 59; but the comparative efficacy of the institutions assuming this name may be measured by certain facts. The number of graduates in the Free States was 47,752, in the Slave States 19,648; the number of ministers educated in Slave colleges was 747, in Free colleges 10,702; and the number of volumes in the libraries of Slave colleges 308,011, in the libraries of Free colleges 668,497. If materials were at hand for comparison between these colleges, in buildings, cabinets, and scientific apparatus, or in standard of scholarship, the difference would be still more apparent.

Of *professional schools*, teaching law, medicine, and theology, the Free States had 65, with 269 professors, 4,417 students, and 175,951 volumes in their libraries; while the Slave States had only 32 professional schools, with 122 professors, 1,816 students, and 30,796 volumes in their libraries. The whole number educated at these institutions in the Free States was 23,513, in the Slave States 3,812. Of these, the largest number in the Slave

States study medicine, next theology, and lastly law. According to the census, there are only 808 students in the Slave theological schools, and 747 studying for the ministry in Slave colleges; and this is the education of the Slave clergy. In the law schools of the Slave States the number of students is only 240, this being the sum-total of public students in the land of Slavery devoted to that profession which is the favorite stepping-stone to political life, where Slave-Masters claim such a disproportion of office and honor.

Of *academies and private schools*, in 1850, the Free States, notwithstanding multitudinous public schools, had 3,197, with 7,175 teachers, 154,893 pupils, and an annual income of $2,457,372; the Slave States had 2,797 academies and private schools, with 4,913 teachers, 104,976 pupils, and an annual income of $2,079,724. In the absence of public schools, to a large extent, where Slavery exists, the dependence must be upon private schools; and yet even here the Slave States fall below the Free States, whether we consider the number of schools, the number of pupils, the number of teachers, or the amount paid for their support.

In *public schools*, open to all, poor and rich alike, the preëminence of the Free States is complete. Here the figures show a difference as wide as that between Freedom and Slavery. Their number in the Free States is 62,433, with 72,621 teachers, and with 2,769,901 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $6,780,337. Their number in the Slave States is 18,507, with 19,307 teachers, and with 581,861 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $2,719,534. This difference may be illustrated by details. Virginia, an old State, and more than a third larger than Ohio, has 67,353 pupils

in her public schools, while the latter State has 484,153. Arkansas, equal in age and size with Michigan, has only 8,493 pupils at her public schools, while the latter State has 110,455. South Carolina, nearly four times as large as Massachusetts, has 17,838 pupils at public schools, while the latter State has 176,475. South Carolina spends for this purpose, annually, $200,600; Massachusetts, $1,006,795. Baltimore, with a population of 169,054, on the northern verge of Slavery, has school buildings valued at $105,729; Boston, with a population of 136,881, has school buildings valued at $729,502. Baltimore has only 37 public schools, with 138 teachers, and 8,011 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $32,423; Boston has 203 public schools, with 353 teachers, and 20,369 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $237,100. Even these figures do not disclose the whole difference; for there exist in the Free States teachers' institutes, normal schools, lyceums, and public courses of lectures, unknown in the region of Slavery. These advantages are enjoyed by the children of colored persons; and here is a comparison which shows the degradation of the Slave States. It is their habit particularly to deride free colored persons. See, now, with what cause. The number of colored persons in the Free States is 196,016, of whom 22,043, or more than one ninth, attend school, which is a larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of the Slave States. In Massachusetts there are 9,064 colored persons, of whom 1,439, or nearly one sixth, attend school, which is a much larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of South Carolina.

Among educational establishments are *public libraries*; and here, again, the Free States have their cus-

tomary eminence, whether we consider libraries strictly called public, or libraries of the common school, Sunday school, college, and church. The disclosures are startling. The number of libraries in the Free States is 14,893, and the sum-total of volumes is 3,883,617; the number of libraries in the Slave States is 713, and the sum-total of volumes is 654,194: showing an excess for Freedom of more than fourteen thousand libraries, and more than three millions of volumes. In the Free States the common-school libraries are 11,881, and contain 1,589,683 volumes; in the Slave States they are 186, and contain 57,721 volumes. In the Free States the Sunday-school libraries are 1,713, and contain 474,241 volumes; in the Slave States they are 275, and contain 68,080 volumes. In the Free States the college libraries are 132, and contain 660,573 volumes; in the Slave States they are 79, and contain 249,248 volumes. In the Free States the church libraries are 109, and contain 52,723 volumes; in the Slave States they are 21, and contain 5,627 volumes. In the Free States the libraries strictly called public, and not included under heads already enumerated, are 1,058, and contain 1,106,397 volumes; those of the Slave States are 152, and contain 273,518 volumes.

Turn these figures over, look at them in any light, and the conclusion is irresistible for Freedom. The college libraries alone of the Free States are greater than all the libraries of Slavery; so, also, are the libraries of Massachusetts alone greater than all the libraries of Slavery; and the common-school libraries alone of New York are more than twice as large as all the libraries of Slavery. Michigan has 107,943 volumes in her libraries; Arkansas has 420; and yet the Acts for

the admission of these two States into the Union were passed on the same day.

Among educational establishments, one of the most efficient is the *press;* and here again all things testify for Freedom. The Free States excel in the number of newspapers and periodicals published, whether daily, semi-weekly, weekly, semi-monthly, monthly, or quarterly, — and whatever their character, whether literary, neutral, political, religious, or scientific. The whole aggregate circulation in the Free States is 334,146,281, in the Slave States 81,038,693; in Free Michigan 3,247,736, in Slave Arkansas 377,000; in Free Ohio 30,473,407, in Slave Kentucky 6,582,838; in Slave South Carolina 7,145,930, in Free Massachusetts 64,820,564, — a larger number than in the twelve Slave States, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, combined. This enormous disproportion in the aggregate is also preserved in the details. In the Slave States political newspapers find more favor than all others together; but even of these they publish only 47,243,209 copies, while the Free States publish 163,583,668. Numerous as are political newspapers in the Free States, they form considerably less than one half the aggregate circulation of the Press, while in the Slave States they constitute nearly three fifths. Of neutral newspapers the Slave States publish 8,812,620, the Free States 79,156,733. Of religious newspapers the Slave States publish 4,364,832, the Free States 29,280,652. Of literary journals the Slave States publish 20,245,360, the Free States 57,478,768. And of scientific journals the Slave States publish 372,672, the Free States 4,521,260. Of these

last the number of copies published in Massachusetts alone is 2,033,260, — more than five times the number in the whole land of Slavery. Thus, in contributions to science, literature, religion, and even politics, as attested by the activity of the periodical press, do the Slave States miserably fail, — while darkness gathers over them, increasing with time. According to the census of 1810, the disproportion in this respect between the two regions was only as two to one; it is now more than four to one, and is still darkening.

The same disproportion appears with regard to persons connected with the Press. In the Free States the number of *printers* was 11,812, of whom 1,229 were in Massachusetts; in the Slave States there were 2,625, of whom South Carolina had only 141. In the Free States the number of *publishers* was 331; in the Slave States, 24. Of these, Massachusetts had 51, or more than twice as many as all the Slave States; while South Carolina had but one. In the Free States the *authors* were 73; in the Slave States, 6, — Massachusetts having 17, and South Carolina none. These suggestive illustrations are all derived from the last official census. If we go to other sources, the contrast is still the same. Of the authors mentioned in Duyckinck's "Cyclopædia of American Literature," 434 are of the Free States, and only 90 of the Slave States. Of the poets mentioned in Griswold's "Poets and Poetry of America," 122 are of the Free States, and only 16 of the Slave States. Of the poets whose place of birth appears in Read's "Female Poets of America," 71 are of the Free States, and only 11 of the Slave States. If we try authors by weight or quality, it is the same as when we try them by numbers. Out of the Free States come all whose

works have a place in the permanent literature of the country, — Irving, Prescott, Sparks, Bancroft, Emerson, Motley, Hildreth, Hawthorne; also, Bryant, Longfellow, Dana, Halleck, Whittier, Lowell, — and I might add indefinitely to the list. But what name from the Slave States can find entrance there?

A similar disproportion appears in the number of *Patents*, during the last three years, 1857, 1858, and 1859, attesting the inventive industry of the contrasted regions. In the Free States there were 9,557; in the Slave States, 1,306: making a difference of 8,251 in favor of Freedom. The number in Free Massachusetts was 1,351; in Slave South Carolina, 39. The number in Free Connecticut, small in territory and population, was 628; in Slave Virginia, large in territory and population, 184.

From these things we might infer the *ignorance* prevalent in the Slave States; but this shows itself in specific results of a deplorable character, authenticated by the official census. In the Slave States there were 493,026 native white adults, persons over twenty years of age, unable to read and write; while in the Free States, with double the native white population, there were but 248,725 persons of this class in this unhappy predicament: in the Slave States the proportion being 1 in 5 of the adult native whites; in the Free States 1 in 22. The number in Free Massachusetts, in an adult native white population of 470,375, was 1,055, or 1 in 446; the number in Slave South Carolina, in a like population of only 120,136, was 15,580, or 1 in 8. The number in Free Connecticut was 1 in 256, in Slave Virginia 1 in 5; in Free New Hampshire 1 in 192, and in Slave North Carolina 1 in 3.

Before leaving this picture, where the dismal colors all come from official sources, there are two other aspects in which Slavery may be regarded.

1. The first is its influence on *emigration*. The official compendium of the census (page 115) tells us that inhabitants of Slave States who are natives of Free States are more numerous than inhabitants of Free States who are natives of Slave States. This is an egregious error. Just the contrary is true. The census of 1850 found 606,139 in the Free States who were born in the Slave States, while only 206,624 born in the Free States were in the Slave States. And since the white population of the Free States is double that of the Slave States, it appears that the proportion of whites moving from Slavery is six times greater than that of whites moving into Slavery. This simple fact discloses something of the aversion to Slavery which is aroused even in the Slave States.

2. The second is furnished by the character of the region on the border-line between Freedom and Slavery. In general, the value of lands in Slave States adjoining Freedom is advanced, while the value of corresponding lands in Free States is diminished. The effects of Freedom and Slavery are reciprocal. Slavery is a bad neighbor; Freedom is a good neighbor. In Virginia, lands naturally poor are, by nearness to Freedom, worth $ 12.98 an acre, while richer lands in other parts of the State are worth only $ 8.42. In Illinois, lands bordering on Slavery are worth only $ 4.54 an acre, while other lands in Illinois are worth $ 8.05. As in the value of lands, so in all other influences is Slavery felt for evil, and Freedom felt for good; and thus is it clearly shown to be for the interest of the Slave States to be surrounded by a circle of Free States.

At every point is the character of Slavery more and more manifest, rising and dilating into an overshadowing Barbarism, darkening the whole land. Through its influence, population, values of all kinds, manufactures, commerce, railroads, canals, charities, the post-office, colleges, professional schools, academies, public schools, newspapers, periodicals, books, authorship, inventions, are all stunted, and, under a Government which professes to be founded on the intelligence of the people, one in five of native white adults in the region of Slavery is officially reported as unable to read and write. Never was the saying of Montesquieu more triumphantly verified, that countries are not cultivated by reason of their fertility, but by reason of their liberty. To this truth the Slave States testify perpetually by every possible voice. Liberty is the powerful agent which drives the plough, the spindle, and the keel, — opens avenues of all kinds, — inspires charity, — awakens love of knowledge, and supplies the means of gratifying it. Liberty is the first of schoolmasters: nay, more; it is the Baconian philosophy of Civilization, through which the powers and activities of man are enlarged beyond measure or imagination.

Unerring and passionless figures thus far are our witnesses. But their testimony will be enhanced by a final glance at the *geographical character* of the Slave States; and here there is a singular and instructive parallel.

Jefferson described Virginia as "fast sinking" to be "the Barbary of the Union," [1] — meaning, of course, the Barbary of his day, which had not yet turned against Slavery. And Franklin also wrote, that he did "not wish to see a new Barbary rising in America, and our

[1] Letter to Joseph C. Cabell, Nov. 28, 1820: Writings, Vol. VII. p. 187.

long extended coast occupied by piratical States."[1] In this each spoke with prophetic voice. Though on different sides of the Atlantic and on different continents, our Slave States and the original Barbary States occupy nearly the same parallels of latitude, occupy nearly the same extent of longitude, embrace nearly the same number of square miles, enjoy kindred advantages of climate, being equally removed from the cold of the North and the burning heat of the tropics, and also have similar boundaries of land and water, affording kindred advantages of ocean and sea, with this difference, that the boundaries of the two regions are precisely reversed, so that where is land in one is water in the other, while in both there is the same extent of ocean and the same extent of sea. Nor is this all. Algiers, for a long time the most obnoxious place in the Barbary States of Africa, once branded by an indignant chronicler as "the wall of the Barbarian world,"[2] is situated near the parallel of 36° 30′ north latitude, being the line of the Missouri Compromise, which once marked the wall of Slavery in our country west of the Mississippi, while Morocco, the chief present seat of Slavery in the African Barbary, is near the parallel of Charleston. There are no two spaces on the surface of the globe, equal in extent, (and careful examination will verify what I am about to state,) which present so many distinctive features of resemblance, whether we consider the common regions of latitude in which they lie, the common nature of their boundaries, their common productions, their common climate,

[1] Letter to David Hartley, May 8, 1788: Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. IX. p. 521.

[2] Purchas's Pilgrims, Vol. II. p. 1565.

or the common Barbarism which sought shelter in both. I do not stop to inquire why Slavery — banished at last from Europe, banished also from that part of this hemisphere which corresponds in latitude to Europe — should have intrenched itself, in both hemispheres, in similar regions of latitude, so that Virginia, Carolina, Mississippi, and Missouri are the American complement to Morocco, Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis. But there is one important point in the parallel which remains to be fulfilled. The barbarous Emperor of Morocco, in the words of a treaty, so long ago as the last century, declared his desire that "the odious name of Slavery might be effaced from the memory of men";[1] while Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis, whose tenacity for the Barbarism was equalled only by that of South Carolina, have renounced it one after another, and delivered it over to the indignation of mankind. Following this example, the parallel will be complete, and our Barbary will become the complement in Freedom to the African Barbary, as it has already been its complement in Slavery, and is unquestionably its complement in geographical character.

II.

FROM the consideration of Slavery in its practical results, illustrated by contrast between the Free States and Slave States, I pass to another stage of the argument, where Slavery appears in its influence on the

[1] "Deseando ademas S. M. Marroqui que se borre de la memoria de los hombres el odioso nombre de esclavitud," etc — *Treaty between Spain and Morocco*, March 1, 1799, Art. XIII.: Martens, Recueil des Traités, 2de Édit., Tom. VI. p. 590.

CHARACTER OF SLAVE-MASTERS. Nothing could I undertake more painful, and yet there is nothing more essential to the discussion, especially in response to pretensions of Senators on this floor, nor is there any point on which the evidence is more ample.

It is in the Character of Slavery itself that we are to find the Character of Slave-Masters. I need not go back to the golden mouth of Chrysostom to learn that "Slavery is the fruit of covetousness, of extravagance, of insatiable greediness";[1] for we have already seen that this fivefold enormity is inspired by the single idea of *compelling men to work without wages.* This spirit must naturally appear in the Slave-Master. But the eloquent Saint did not disclose the whole truth. Slavery is founded on violence, as we have already too clearly seen; of course it can be sustained only by kindred violence, sometimes against the defenceless slave, sometimes against the freeman whose indignation is aroused at the outrage. It is founded on brutal and vulgar pretensions, as is unhappily too apparent; of course it can be sustained only by kindred brutality and vulgarity. The denial of all rights in the slave can be sustained only by disregard of other rights, common to the whole community, whether of the person, the press, or speech. Where this exists there can be but one supreme law, to which all other laws, statute or social, are subordinate, — and this is the pretended law of Slavery. All these things must be manifest in Slave-Masters; and yet, unconscious of their true condition, they make boasts which reveal still further the unhappy influence. Barbarous standards of conduct are unblushingly avowed. The swagger of a bully is called

[1] In Epist. ad Ephes. Homil. XXII. 2.

chivalry; a swiftness to quarrel is called courage; the bludgeon is adopted as substitute for argument; and assassination is lifted to be one of the Fine Arts. Long ago it was fixed certain that the day which makes man a slave "takes half his worth away," — words from the ancient harp of Homer, sounding through long generations. Nothing here is said of the human being at the other end of the chain. To aver that on this same day all his worth is taken away might seem inconsistent with exceptions which we gladly recognize; but, alas! it is too clear, both from reason and from facts, that, bad as Slavery is for the Slave, it is worse for the Master.

In making this exposure I am fortified at the outset by two classes of authority, whose testimony it will be difficult to question: the first personal, and founded on actual experience; the second philosophical, and founded on everlasting truth.

First, *Personal Authority.* And here I adduce words, often quoted, which dropped from the lips of Slave-Masters in those better days, when, seeing the wrong of Slavery, they escaped from its injurious influence. Of these, none expressed themselves with more vigor than George Mason, a Slave-Master from Virginia, in debate on the adoption of the National Constitution. This is his language: —

"Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor, when performed by slaves. They prevent the emigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. *They produce the most pernicious effect on manners.* EVERY MASTER OF SLAVES IS BORN A PETTY TYRANT. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country."[1]

[1] Debates in the Federal Convention, August 22, 1787: Madison Papers, Vol. III. p. 1391.

Thus, with a few touches, does this Slave-Master portray his class, putting them in that hateful list which, according to every principle of liberty, must be resisted so long as we obey God. And this clear testimony received kindred support from the fiery soul of Jefferson. Here are his words: —

"There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people produced by the existence of Slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, THE MOST UNREMITTING DESPOTISM on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it. . . . . *The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances.* And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, *transforms those into despots* and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part and the *amor patriæ* of the other! . . . . With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed."[1]

Next comes the *Philosophic Authority.* Here, while the language which I quote may be less familiar, it is hardly less commanding. Among names of such weight I shall not discriminate, but simply follow the order of time. First is John Locke, the great author of the English system of Intellectual Philosophy, who, though once unhappily indulgent to American Slavery, in another place describes it, in words which every Slave-Master should know, as —

"The state of war continued between a lawful conqueror and a captive." "So directly opposite to the generous temper and courage of our nation, that *'t is hardly to be con-*

[1] Notes on Virginia, Query XVIII.

ceived that an Englishman, MUCH LESS A GENTLEMAN, *should plead for 't.*" [1]

Then comes Adam Smith, the founder of the science of Political Economy, who, in his work on Morals, thus utters himself: —

"There is not a negro from the coast of Africa who does not possess a degree of magnanimity which the soul of his sordid master is too often scarce capable of conceiving. Fortune never exerted more cruelly her empire over mankind than when she subjected those nations of heroes to the refuse of the jails of Europe, to wretches who possess the virtues neither of the countries which they come from nor of those which they go to, *and whose levity, brutality, and baseness so justly expose them to the contempt of the vanquished.*" [2]

This judgment, pronounced just a century ago, was repelled by the Slave-Masters of Virginia in a feeble publication, which attests at least their own consciousness that they were the criminals arraigned by the distinguished philosopher. This was soon followed by the testimony of the great English moralist, Dr. Johnson, who, in a letter to a friend, thus shows his opinion of Slave-Masters: —

"To omit for a year, or for a day, the most efficacious method of advancing Christianity, in compliance with any purposes that terminate on this side of the grave, is a crime of which I know not that the world has yet had an example, except in the practice of *the planters of America, a race of mortals whom, I suppose, no other man wishes to resemble.*" [3]

[1] Of Government, Book II. ch. 4, Book I. ch 1.

[2] Theory of Moral Sentiments, Part V. ch. 2.

[3] Letter to William Drummond, August 18, 1766: Boswell's Life of Johnson, ed. Croker, (London, 1835,) Vol. III. p. 11.

These are British voices. There are French also of equal character, whose is the same implacable judgment. First I name Condorcet, who did so much to develop the idea of Human Progress. Constantly he testifies against Slavery. His brand of it as Barbarism is sententiously expressed in a letter to Voltaire, describing a successful Slave-Master: —

"L'Éprémesnil is a little American, who, by dint of plying his negroes with the lash, has succeeded in getting enough sugar and indigo to buy an office of King's Councillor in the revenue service." [1]

Voltaire adds to this expression other words kindred in scorn: —

"The American savage of whom you speak does not astonish me; but he frightens me, for I know beyond doubt that he is of the horde of other French savages who have sworn immortal hate to reason." [2]

In harmony with these is that famous irony of Montesquieu, where, speaking of the Africans, he says: —

"It is impossible that we should suppose these people men; because, if we supposed them men, the world would begin to think that we ourselves were not Christians." [3]

Other countries might testify; but this is enough.

With such authorities, Personal and Philosophic, American and Foreign, I need not hesitate in this ungracious task; but Truth, which is mightier than Mason and Jefferson, than John Locke, Adam Smith, and Samuel Johnson, than Condorcet, Voltaire, and

[1] Condorcet, Œuvres, ed O'Connor, Tom. I. p. 88, Décembre, 1775.
[2] Ibid., p. 98, 6 Février, 1776.
[3] Esprit des Lois, Liv. XV. ch. 5.

Montesquieu, marshals the evidence in unbroken succession.

Proceeding with the argument, broadening as we advance, we shall see Slave-Masters (1) in the Law of Slavery, (2) in relations with Slaves, (3) in relations with each other and with Society, and (4) in that unconsciousness which renders them insensible to their true character.

(1.) As in considering the Character of Slavery, so in considering the Character of Slave-Masters, we must begin with the *Law of Slavery*, which, as their work, testifies against them. In the face of this unutterable abomination, where impiety, cruelty, brutality, and robbery all strive for mastery, it is vain to assert humanity or refinement in its authors. Full well I know that the conscience, which speaks so powerfully to the solitary soul, is often silent in the corporate body, and that, in all ages and countries, numbers, when gathered in communities and States, have sanctioned acts from which the individual revolts. And yet I know no surer way of judging a people than by its laws, especially where those laws have been long continued and openly maintained.

Whatever may be the eminence of individual virtue, — and I would not so far disparage humanity as to suppose that offences so general where Slavery exists are universal, — it is not reasonable or logical to infer that the body of Slave-Masters are better than the Law of Slavery. And since the Law itself degrades the slave to be a chattel, and submits him to irresponsible control, — with power to bind and to scourge, to usurp the fruits of another's labor, to pollute the body, and to

outrage all ties of family, making marriage impossible, — we must conclude that such enormities are sanctioned by Slave-Masters; while the refusal of testimony, and the denial of instruction, by supplementary law, complete the evidence of complicity. And this conclusion must stand unquestioned, just so long as the Law of Slavery exists unrepealed. So mild and philosophical a judge as Tocqueville says, in his authoritative work: "The legislation of the Southern States with regard to slaves at the present day exhibits such unparalleled atrocities as suffice to show that the laws of humanity have been totally perverted, and to betray the desperate position of the community in which that legislation has been promulgated."[1] All of which is too true. Cease, then, to blazon the humanity of Slave-Masters. Tell me not of the lenity with which this cruel Code is tempered to its unhappy subjects. Tell me not of the sympathy which overflows from the mansion of the master to the cabin of the slave. In vain you assert such "happy accidents." In vain you show individuals who do not exert the wickedness of the law. The Barbarism still endures, solemnly, legislatively, judicially attested in the very SLAVE CODE, and proclaiming constantly the character of its authors. And this is the first article in the evidence against Slave-Masters.

(2.) I am next brought to *Slave-Masters in their relations with Slaves;* and here the argument is founded on facts, and on presumptions irresistible as facts. Only lately has inquiry burst into that gloomy world of bond-

[1] Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Chap. XVIII.: *Situation of the Black Population.*

age, and disclosed its secrets. But enough is already known to arouse the indignant condemnation of mankind. For instance, here is a simple advertisement — one of thousands — from the *Georgia Messenger*: —

"RUN AWAY. — My man Fountain; has holes in his ears, a scar on the right side of his forehead; has been shot in the hind parts of his legs; is marked on his back with the whip. Apply to Robert Beasley, Macon, Ga."

Holes in the ears; scar on the forehead; shot in the legs; and marks of the lash on the back! Such are tokens by which the Slave-Master identifies his slave.

Here is another advertisement, revealing Slave-Masters in a different light. It is from the *National Intelligencer*, published at the capital; and I confess the pain with which I cite such an indecency in a journal of much respectability. Of course it appeared without the knowledge of the editors; but it is none the less an illustrative example.

"FOR SALE. — An accomplished and handsome lady's-maid. She is just sixteen years of age; was raised in a genteel family in Maryland; and is now proposed to be sold, not for any fault, but simply because the owner has no further use for her. A note directed to C. D., Gadsby's Hotel, will receive prompt attention."

A sated libertine, in a land where vice is legalized, could not expose his victim with apter words.

These two instances illustrate a class.

In the recent work of Mr. Olmsted, a close observer and traveller in the Slave States, which abounds in pictures of Slavery, drawn with caution and evident regard to truth, is another, where a Slave-Master thus frankly confesses his experience: —

"'I can tell you how you can break a nigger of running away, certain,' said the Slave-Master. 'There was an old fellow I used to know in Georgia, that always cured his so. If a nigger ran away, when he caught him, he would bind his knee over a log, and fasten him so he could n't stir; then he 'd take a pair of pincers, and pull one of his toe-nails out by the roots, and tell him, that, if he ever run away again, he would pull out two of them, and if he run away again after that, he told him he 'd pull out four of them, and so on, doubling each time. He never had to do it more than twice; it always cured them.'"[1]

Like this story, from the lips of a Slave-Master, is another, where the master, angry because his slave sought to regain his God-given liberty, deliberately cut the tendons of his heel, thus horribly maiming him for life.

In vain these instances are denied. Their accumulating number, authenticated in every possible manner, by the press, by a cloud of witnesses, and by the confession of Slave-Masters, stares us constantly in the face.

Here we are brought again to the Slave Code, under the shelter of which these things, and worse, are done with complete impunity. Listen to the remarkable words of Mr. Justice Ruffin, of North Carolina, who, in a solemn decision, thus portrays, affirms, and deplores this terrible latitude. The obedience of the slave, he says, —

"is the consequence only of *uncontrolled authority over the body. . . . . The power of the master must be absolute, to render the submission of the slave perfect.* I most freely confess my sense of the harshness of this proposition. I feel

[1] Journey through Texas, by Frederick Law Olmsted, p. 105.

it as deeply as any man can. And, as a principle of moral right, every person in his retirement must repudiate it. But in the actual condition of things it must be so. There is no remedy. *This discipline belongs to the state of Slavery.* . . . . It is inherent in the relation of master and slave." [1]

This same license is thus expounded in a recent judicial decision of Virginia: —

"It is the policy of the law in respect to the relation of master and slave, and for the sake of securing proper subordination and obedience on the part of the slave, *to protect the master from prosecution, even if the whipping and punishment be malicious, cruel, and excessive.*" [2]

Can Barbarism further go? Here is irresponsible power, rendered more irresponsible still by the seclusion of the plantation, and absolutely fortified by supplementary law excluding the testimony of slaves. That under its shelter enormities should occur, stranger than fiction, too terrible for imagination, and surpassing any attested experience, is simply according to the course of Nature and the course of history. Antiquity has illustrations which are most painful. From Ovid we learn how the porter was chained at his master's gate; [3] by Plautus we are introduced to the various instruments of punishment, in fearful catalogue; [4] and in the pages of the philosopher Seneca we are saddened by the cruelties of which the slave was victim. [5] A later writer, the great teacher of medicine, Galen, describes men

[1] The State v. Mann, 2 Devereux, North Carolina Reports, 266, 267.
[2] Souther v. The Commonwealth, 7 Grattan, 680.
[3] Amorum Lib. I Eleg. VI. 1.
[4] Asinaria, Act. III. Sc. ii. 4, 5.
[5] Epist. XLVII.

knocking out the teeth of slaves with the fist, falling upon them not only with fist, but with the heels, and gouging the eyes with a pen, if at hand, as did the Emperor Adrian on one occasion;[1] while Tacitus shows how four hundred slaves in the house of an assassinated master were handed over to vindictive death.[2] St. Chrysostom portrays a mistress dragging a slave-girl by the hair, and herself applying the whip, until the cries of her bruised victim filled the whole house and penetrated the street.[3]

All this is ancient Barbarism, according to the evidence; but the analogies of life show that such things must be, where Slavery prevails. The visitation of the abbeys in England disclosed vice and disorder in startling forms, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of monastic life. A similar visitation of plantations would disclose more fearful results, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of Slavery. Every Slave-Master on his plantation is a Bashaw, with all the prerogatives of a Turk. According to Hobbes, he is a "petty king." This is true; and every plantation is of itself a petty kingdom, with more than the immunities of an abbey. Six thousand skulls of infants are reported to have been taken from a single fish-pond near a nunnery, to the dismay of Pope Gregory.[4] Under the Law of Slavery,

[1] De Animi Affectuum Dignotione et Curatione, Cap. IV.: Opera, ed. Kühn, Tom. V. p. 17.

[2] Annal. Lib. XIV. capp. 42–45. See the memoir of M. de Burigny, *Sur les Esclaves Romains:* Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, 1764–1766, Tom. XXXV. pp. 328–359.

[3] In Epist. ad Ephes. Homil. XV. 3.

[4] "Memorabile quod Ulricus epistola refert, Gregorium, quum ex piscina quadam allata plus quam sex mille infantum capita vidisset, ingemuisse." — BURTON, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Part III. Sec. 2, Mem. 5, Subs. 5. He quotes Kemnicius, *Examen Concil. Trident., Pars III., De Cœlibatu Sacerdotum.*

infants, the offspring of masters "who dream of Freedom in a slave's embrace," are not thrown into a fish-pond, but something worse is done. They are sold. This is a single glimpse only. Slavery, in its recesses, is another Bastile, whose horrors will never be known until it shall be razed to the ground; it is the dismal castle of Giant Despair, which, when captured by the Pilgrims, excited their wonder, as they saw "the dead bodies that lay here and there in the castle-yard, and how full of dead men's bones the dungeon was." The recorded horrors of Slavery are infinite, and each day, by the escape of its victims, they are still further attested, while the door of the vast prison-house is left ajar. But, alas! unless examples of history and lessons of political wisdom are alike delusive, its unrecorded horrors must assume a form of more fearful dimensions. Baffling all attempts at description, they sink into that chapter of Sir Thomas Browne entitled "Of some Relations whose Truth we fear," and among kindred things whereof, according to this eloquent philosopher, "there remains no register but that of Hell."

If this picture of the relations of Slave-Masters with their slaves could receive any darker coloring, it would be by introducing figures of the congenial agents through which the Barbarism is maintained, — *the Slave-Overseer, the Slave-Breeder, and the Slave-Hunter*, each without a peer except in the brothers, and the whole constituting a triumvirate of Slavery, in whom its essential brutality, vulgarity, and crime are all embodied. There is the Slave-Overseer, with bloody lash, — fitly described, in his Life of Patrick Henry, by Mr. Wirt, who, born in a Slave State, knew the class, as

"last and lowest, most abject, degraded, unprincipled," [1] — and his hands wield at will the irresponsible power, being proper successor to "the devil," described by the English dramatist, who appeared

> "*in Virginia*, and commanded
> With many stripes; for that 's his cruel custom." [2]

There is next the Slave-Breeder, who assumes a higher character, even entering legislative halls, where, in unconscious insensibility, he shocks civilization by denying, like Mr. Gholson, of Virginia, any alleged distinction between the "female slave" and the "brood mare," by openly asserting the necessary respite from work during the gestation of the female slave as the ground of property in her offspring, and by proclaiming that in this "vigintial" crop of human flesh consists much of the wealth of his State, — while another Virginian, not yet hardened to this debasing trade, whose annual sacrifice reaches twenty-five thousand human souls, confesses the indignation and shame with which he beholds his State "converted into *one grand menagerie*, where men are reared for the market, like oxen for the shambles." Verily the question may be asked, Have we a Guinea among us? And, lastly, there is the Slave-Hunter, with the bloodhound as his brutal symbol, who pursues slaves as the hunter pursues game, and does not hesitate in the public prints to advertise his Barbarism thus: —

"BLOODHOUNDS. — I have TWO of the FINEST DOGS for CATCHING NEGROES in the Southwest. They can take the trail TWELVE HOURS after the NEGRO HAS PASSED, and catch him with ease. I live four miles

[1] Life and Character of Patrick Henry, Sec. II. p. 34.
[2] Massinger, The City Madam, Act V. sc. 1.

southwest of Bolivar, on the road leading from Bolivar to Whitesville. I am ready at all times to catch runaway negroes.

"DAVID TURNER.

"March 2, 1853."[1]

The bloodhound was known in early Scottish history; it was once vindictively put upon the trail of Robert Bruce, and in barbarous days, by cruel license of war, was directed against the marauders of the Scottish border. Walter Scott makes one of his heroes "cheer the dark blood-hound on his way"; but more than a century has passed since the last survivor of the race was seen in Ettrick Forest.[2] The bloodhound was employed by Spain against the natives of this continent, and the eloquence of Chatham never touched a truer chord than when, gathering force from the condemnation of this brutality, he poured his thunder upon the kindred brutality of the scalping-knife, adopted as an instrument of war by a nation professing civilization. Tardily introduced into this Republic some time after the Missouri Compromise, when Slavery became a political passion and Slave-Masters began to throw aside all disguise, the bloodhound has become the representative of our Barbarism, when engaged in the pursuit of a fellow-man asserting his inborn title to himself; and this brute becomes typical of the whole brutal leash of Slave-Hunters, who, whether at home on Slave Soil, under the name of Slave-Catchers and Kidnappers, or at a distance, under politer names, insult Human Nature by the enforcement of this Barbarism.

[1] West Tennessee Democrat.

[2] Scott, Lay of the Last Minstrel, Notes, Canto V. st. 29.

(3.) From this dreary picture of Slave-Masters with their slaves and their triumvirate of vulgar instruments, I pass to another more dreary still, and more completely exposing the influence of Slavery: I mean the *relations of Slave-Masters with each other*, also *with Society* and *Government*, — or, in other words, the Character of Slave-Masters, as displayed in the general relations of life. Here again I need your indulgence. Not in triumph or in taunt do I approach this branch of the subject. Yielding only to the irresistible exigency of the discussion, and in direct reply to the assumptions on this floor, especially by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], I proceed. If I touch Slavery to the quick, and make Slave-Masters see themselves as others see them, I shall do nothing beyond the strictest line of duty in this debate.

One of the choicest passages of the master Italian poet, Dante, is where we are permitted to behold a passage of transcendent virtue sculptured in "visible speech" on the long gallery leading to the Heavenly Gate. The poet felt the inspiration of the scene, and placed it on the wayside, where it could charm and encourage. This was natural. Nobody can look upon virtue and justice, if only in images and pictures, without feeling a kindred sentiment. Nobody can be surrounded by vice and wrong, by violence and brutality, if only in images and pictures, without coming under their degrading influence. Nobody can live with the one without advantage; nobody can live with the other without loss. Who could pass life in the secret chamber where are gathered the impure relics of Pompeii, without becoming indifferent to loathsome things? But if these loathsome things are not merely sculptured and

painted, — if they exist in living reality, — if they enact their hideous, open indecencies, as in the criminal pretensions of Slavery, — while the lash plays and the blood spurts, — while women are whipped and children are sold, — while marriage is polluted and annulled, — while the parental tie is rudely torn, — while honest gains are filched or robbed, — while the soul itself is shut down in all the darkness of ignorance, and God himself is defied in the pretension that man can have property in his fellow-man, — if all these things are "visible," not merely in images and pictures, but in reality, the influence on character must be incalculably deplorable.

According to irresistible law men are fashioned by what is about them, whether climate, scenery, life, or institutions. Like produces like, and this ancient proverb is verified always. Look at the miner, delving low down in darkness, and the mountaineer, ranging on airy heights, and you will see a contrast in character, and even in personal form. The difference between a coward and a hero may be traced in the atmosphere which each has breathed, — and how much more in the institutions under which each is reared! If institutions generous and just ripen souls also generous and just, then other institutions must exhibit their influence also. Violence, brutality, injustice, barbarism, must be reproduced in the lives of all living within their fatal sphere. The meat eaten by man enters into and becomes part of his body; the madder eaten by the dog changes his bones to red; and the Slavery on which men live, in all its fivefold foulness, must become part of themselves, discoloring the very soul, blotting the character, and breaking forth in moral leprosy. This language is

strong, but the evidence is even stronger. Some there may be of happy natures — like honorable Senators — who can thus feed and not be harmed. Mithridates fed on poison, and lived. It may be that there is a moral Mithridates, who can swallow without bane the poison of Slavery.

Instead of "ennobling" the master, nothing is clearer than that the slave drags his master down; and this process, beginning in childhood, is continued through life. Living much in association with his slave, the master finds nothing to remind him of his own deficiencies, to prompt his ambition or excite his shame. He is only a little better than his predecessor in ancient Germany, as described by Tacitus, who was distinguishable from his slave by none of the charms of education, while the two burrowed among the same flocks and in the same ground.[1] Without provocation to virtue, or elevating example, he naturally shares the Barbarism of the society he keeps. Thus the very inferiority which the Slave-Master attributes to the African explains the melancholy condition of the communities in which his degradation is declared by law.

A single false principle or vicious thought may debase a character otherwise blameless; and this is practically true of the Slave-Master. Accustomed to regard men as property, the sensibilities are blunted and the moral sense is obscured. He consents to acts from which Civilization recoils. The early Church sacrificed its property, and even its sacred vessels, for the redemption of captives. On a memorable occasion this was done by St. Ambrose,[2] and successive canons confirmed

[1] "Dominum ac servum nullis educationis deliciis dignoscas. Inter eadem pecora, in eadem humo degunt." — *Germania*, c. 20.

[2] Butler, Lives of the Saints, Vol. XII. p. 114.

the example. But in the Slave States all is reversed. Slaves there are hawked as property of the Church[1]; and an instance is related of a slave sold in South Carolina to buy plate for the communion-table. Who can estimate the effect of such an example?

Surrounded by pernicious influences of all kinds, positive and negative, the first making him do that which he ought not to do, and the second making him leave undone that which he ought to have done, — through childhood, youth, and manhood, even unto age, — unable, while at home, to escape these influences, overshadowed constantly by the portentous Barbarism about him, the Slave-Master naturally adopts the bludgeon, the revolver, and the bowie-knife. Through these he governs his plantation, and secretly armed with these enters the world. These are his congenial companions. To wear these is his pride; to use them becomes a passion, almost a necessity. Nothing contributes to violence so much as wearing the instruments of violence, thus having them always at hand to obey a lawless instinct. A barbarous standard is established; the duel is not dishonorable; a contest peculiar to our Slave-Masters, known as a "street fight," is not shameful; and modern imitators of Cain have a mark set upon them, not for reproach and condemnation, but for compliment and approval. In kindred spirit, the Count of Eisenburg, presenting to Erasmus a handsome dagger, called it "the pen with which he used to combat saucy

[1] This is a natural incident of Slavery. Bishop Warburton, in a sermon before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, recounts how "a very worthy benefactor bequeathed unto us in trust, for the propagation of the Gospel, a plantation stocked with slaves," and he exclaims, "An odd legacy to the promulgators of the Law of Liberty!" — *Sermon XX.*: Works, (London, 1811,) Vol. X. p. 58.

fellows."[1] How weak that dagger against the pen of Erasmus! I wish to keep within bounds; but unanswerable facts, accumulating in fearful quantities, attest that the social system so much vaunted by honorable Senators, which we are now asked to sanction and extend, takes its character from this spirit, and, with professions of Christianity on the lips, becomes Cain-like. And this is aggravated by the prevailing ignorance in the Slave States, where one in five of the adult white population of native birth is unable to read and write.

> "The boldest they who least partake the light,
> As game-cocks in the dark are trained to fight."

There are exceptions, which we all gladly recognize; but it is this spirit which predominates and gives the social law. Again we see the lordlings of France, as pictured by Camille Desmoulins, "ordinarily very feeble in arguments, since from the cradle they are accustomed to use their *will* as right hand and their *reason* as left hand."[2] Violence ensues. And here mark an important difference. Elsewhere violence shows itself in *spite* of law, whether social or statute; in the Slave States it is *because* of law, both social and statute. Elsewhere it is pursued and condemned; in the Slave States it is adopted and honored. Elsewhere it is hunted as a crime; in the Slave States it takes its place among the honorable graces of society.

Let not these harsh statements stand on my authority. Listen to the testimony of two Governors of Slave States in messages to their respective Legislatures.

Said the Governor of Kentucky, in 1837:—

[1] Jortin, Life of Erasmus, A. D. 1532, Ætat 65, Vol. II. p. 31.
[2] Louis Blanc, Histoire de la Révolution Française, Tom. V. p. 200.

"We long to see the day when the law will assert its majesty, and stop the wanton destruction of life which almost *daily* occurs within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. *Men slaughter each other with almost perfect impunity.* A species of Common Law has grown up in Kentucky, which, were it written down, would, in all civilized countries, cause it to be re-christened, in derision, *the Land of Blood.*"

Such was the official confession of a Slave-Master, Governor of Kentucky. And here is the official confession made the same year by the Slave-Master Governor of Alabama: —

"We hear of homicides in different parts of the State continually, and yet have few convictions, and still fewer executions. Why do we hear of *stabbings and shootings almost daily* in some part or other of our State?"

A land of blood! Stabbings and shootings almost daily! Such is official language. It was natural that contemporary newspapers should repeat what found utterance in high places. Here is the confession of a newspaper in Mississippi: —

"The moral atmosphere in our State appears to be in a *deleterious and sanguinary condition.* Almost every exchange paper which reaches us contains *some inhuman and revolting case of murder or death by violence.*"[1]

Here is another confession, by a newspaper in New Orleans: —

"In view of the crimes which are daily committed, we are led to inquire whether it is owing to the inefficiency of our laws, or to the manner in which these laws are administered,

[1] Grand Gulf Advertiser, June 27, 1837.

that this frightful deluge of human blood flows through our streets and our places of public resort." [1]

And here is testimony of a different character: —

"As I left my native State on account of Slavery, and deserted the home of my fathers to escape the sound of the lash and the shrieks of tortured victims, I would gladly bury in oblivion the recollection of those scenes with which I have been familiar; but this may not, cannot be." [2]

These are the words of a Southern lady, daughter of the accomplished Judge Grimké, of South Carolina.

A catalogue of affrays between politicians, commonly known as "street fights," — I use the phrase furnished by the land of Slavery, — would show that these authorities are not mistaken. That famous Dutch picture, admired particularly from successful engraving, and called *The Knife-Fighters*,[3] presents a scene less revolting than one of these. Two or more men, armed to the teeth, meet in the streets, at a court-house, or a tavern, shoot at each other with revolvers, then gash each other with knives, close, and roll upon the ground, covered with dirt and blood, struggling and stabbing, till death, prostration, or surrender puts an end to the conflict. Each instance tells its shameful story, and cries out against the social system tolerating such Barbarism. A catalogue of duels would testify again to the reckless disregard of life where Slavery exists, while it exhibited Violence flaunting in the garb of Honor, and prating of a barbarous code disowned equally by reason and re-

[1] New Orleans Bee, May 23, 1838.

[2] Narrative and Testimony of Sarah M. Grimké, found in the remarkable contribution to the Antislavery cause by Theodore D. Weld, American Slavery as it is, Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses, p. 22.

[3] There are two different pictures of this early scene, — one by Terburg, and the other by Adrian van Ostade, — both engraved by Suyderhoef.

ligion. But you have already surfeited with horrors, and I hasten on.

Ancient Civilization did not condemn assassination. Statues were raised to Harmodius and Aristogeiton, who slew Hipparchus. Brutus and Cassius were glorified. Modern Civilization judges otherwise; but Slavery, not content with the Duel, which was unknown to Antiquity, rejoices in assassinations also, — rejoices in both.

Pardon me, if I stop for one moment to expose and denounce the Duel. I do it only because it belongs to the brood of Slavery. Long ago an enlightened Civilization rejected this relic of Barbarism, and never was one part of the argument against it put more sententiously than by Franklin. "A duel decides nothing," said this patriot philosopher; and the person appealing to it "makes himself judge in his own cause, condemns the offender without a jury, and undertakes himself to be the executioner."[1] To these emphatic words I add two brief propositions, which, if practically adopted, make the Duel impossible: first, that the acknowledgment of wrong, with apology or explanation, can never be otherwise than honorable; and, secondly, that, in the absence of such acknowledgment, no wrong can be repaired by gladiatorial contest, where brute force, or skill, or chance must decide the day. Iron and adamant are not stronger than these arguments; nor can any one attempt an answer without exposing his feebleness. And yet Slave-Masters, disregarding its irrational character, insensible to its folly, heedless of its impiety, and unconscious of its Barbarism, openly adopt the Duel as

[1] Letter to Thomas Percival, July 17, 1784: Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. p. 108.

regulator of manners and conduct. Two voices from South Carolina have been raised against it, and I mention them with gladness as testimony from that land of Slavery. The first was Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who, in the early days of the Republic, after asking if there were "no way of abolishing throughout the Union this absurd and *barbarous* custom," invoked the clergy of his State, "as a particular favor, at some convenient early day, to preach a sermon on the sin and folly of duelling."[1] The other was Mr. Rhett, who, on this floor, openly declared, as his reason for declining the Duel, "that he feared God more than man."[2] Generous words, for which many errors will be pardoned. But these voices condemn the social system of which the Duel is a natural product.

Looking at the broad surface of society where Slavery exists, we find its spirit actively manifest against all freedom of speech and the press, especially with regard to this wrong. Nobody in the Slave States can speak or print plainly about Slavery, except at peril of life or liberty; and a curious instance shows how this same spirit is carried by our Slave-Masters into foreign lands. As early as 1789, and in Paris, a poor play,[3] where Slavery was painted truthfully, excited the hostility of what Baron Grimm, who reports the incident, calls "an American cabal," so that its failure was attributed by some to this influence, being the early prototype of that so strong among us. St. Paul could call upon the people of Athens to give up the worship of unknown

[1] Sabine, Notes on Duels and Duelling, pp. 322, 324.

[2] Speech in the Senate, February 28, 1852: Congressional Globe, 32d Cong. 1st Sess., p. 655.

[3] L'Esclavage des Nègres, ou l'Heureux Naufrage. See Grimm, Correspondance, Tom. XVI. pp. 328, 329, Décembre, 1789.

gods; he could live in his own hired house at Rome, and preach Christianity in this Heathen metropolis; but no man can be heard against Slavery in Charleston or Mobile. We condemn the Inquisition, which subjects all within its influence to censorship and secret judgment; but this tyranny is repeated in American Slave-Masters. Truths as simple as the great discovery of Galileo are openly denied, and all who declare them are driven to recant. We condemn the "Index Expurgatorius" of the Roman Church; but American Slave-Masters have an Index where are inscribed all the generous books of the age. One book, the marvel of recent literature, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," is treated thus by the Church as by Slave-Masters, being honored by the same suppression at the Vatican as at Charleston.

Not to dwell on these instances, there is one which has a most instructive ridiculousness. A religious discourse of the late Dr. Channing on West India Emancipation — the last effort of his beautiful life — was offered for sale by a book agent at Charleston. A prosecution by the South Carolina Association ensued, and the agent was held to bail in the sum of one thousand dollars. Shortly afterward, the same agent received for sale a work by Dickens, "American Notes," freshly published; but, determined not to expose himself again to the tyrannical Inquisition, he gave notice through the newspapers that the book would "be submitted to highly intelligent members of the South Carolina Association for *inspection*, and *if* the sale is approved by them, it will be for sale, — if not, not." [1]

[1] Address to the Inhabitants of New Mexico and California, by William Jay: Miscellaneous Writings, p. 536.

Listen also to another recent instance, as recounted in the "Montgomery Mail," a newspaper of Alabama.

"Last Saturday we devoted to the flames a large number of copies of Spurgeon's Sermons, and the pile was graced at the top with a copy of 'Graves's Great Iron Wheel,' which a Baptist friend presented for the purpose. We trust that the works of the greasy cockney vociferator may receive the same treatment throughout the South. And if the Pharisaical author should ever show himself in these parts, we trust that a stout cord may speedily find its way around his eloquent throat. He has proved himself a dirty, low-bred slanderer, and ought to be treated accordingly."

Very recently we had the opportunity of reading in the journals, that the trustees of a college in Alabama resolved against Dr. Wayland's admirable work on Moral Science, as containing "Abolition doctrine of the deepest dye," and proceeded to denounce "the said book, and forbid its further use in the Institute."

The speeches of Wilberforce in the British Parliament, and especially those magnificent efforts of Brougham, where he exposed "the wild and guilty fantasy that man can hold property in man," were insanely denounced by the British planters in the West Indies; but our Slave-Masters go further. Speeches delivered in the Senate are stopped at the Post-Office; booksellers receiving them have been mobbed; and on at least one occasion the speeches were solemnly proceeded against by a Grand Jury.[1]

All this is natural, for tyranny is condemned to be consistent with itself. Proclaim Slavery a permanent institution, instead of a temporary Barbarism, soon to

[1] This was the case with Mr. Sumner's speech, "The Crime against Kansas." More than one person found with a copy of this speech was compelled to flee.

pass away, and then, by the unhesitating logic of self-preservation, all things must yield to its support. The safety of Slavery becomes the supreme law. And since Slavery is endangered by Liberty in any form, therefore all Liberty must be restrained. Such is the philosophy of this seeming paradox in a Republic. And our Slave-Masters show themselves apt. Violence and brutality are their ready instruments, quickened always by the wakefulness of suspicion, and perhaps often by the restlessness of uneasy conscience. The Lion's Mouth of Venice is open everywhere in the Slave States; nor are wanting the gloomy cells and the Bridge of Sighs.

This spirit has recently shown itself with such intensity and activity as to constitute what is properly termed a Reign of Terror. Northern men, unless recognized as delegates to a Democratic Convention, are exposed in their travels, whether for business or health. They are watched and dogged, as in a land of Despotism, — are treated with the meanness of disgusting tyranny, — and live in peril always of personal indignity, often of life and limb. Complaint is sometimes made of wrongs to American citizens in Mexico; but the last year witnessed outrages on American citizens perpetrated in the Slave States exceeding those in Mexico. Here, again, I have no time for details, already presented in other quarters. Instances are from all conditions of life and in various quarters. In Missouri, a Methodist clergyman, suspected of being an Abolitionist, was taken to prison, amidst threats of tar and feathers. In Arkansas, a schoolmaster was driven from the State. In Kentucky, a plain citizen from Indiana, on a visit to his friends, was threatened with death by the rope. In Alabama, a simple person from Connecticut, peddling

books, was thrust into prison, amidst cries of "Shoot him! Hang him!" In Virginia, a Shaker, from New York, peddling garden-seeds, was forcibly expelled from the State. In Georgia, a merchant's clerk, Irish by birth, who simply asked the settlement of a just debt, was cast into prison, robbed of his pocket-book containing nearly one hundred dollars, and barely escaped with life. In South Carolina, a stone-cutter, also an Irishman, was stripped naked, and then, amidst cries of "Brand him!" "Burn him!" "Spike him to death!" scourged so that blood came at every stroke, while tar was poured upon the lacerated flesh. These atrocities, calculated, according to the words of a great poet, to "make a holiday in Hell," were all ordained by Vigilance Committees, or that swiftest magistrate, Judge Lynch, inspired by the demon of Slavery.

> "He let them loose, and cried, Halloo!
> How shall we yield him honor due?"[1]

In perfect shamelessness, and as if to blazon this fiendish spirit, we have this winter had an article in a leading newspaper of Virginia, offering twenty-five dollars each for the heads of citizens, mostly Members of Congress, known to be against Slavery, with fifty thousand dollars for the head of William H. Seward. In still another paper of Virginia we find a proposition to raise ten thousand dollars for the kidnapping, and delivery at Richmond, of a venerable citizen, Joshua R. Giddings, "or five thousand dollars for the production of his head." These are fresh instances, but not alone. At a meeting of Slave-Masters in Georgia, in 1836, the Governor was recommended to issue a proclamation offering five thousand dollars as a reward for the ap-

[1] Coleridge, Fire, Famine, and Slaughter.

prehension of *either* of ten persons named in the resolution, citizens of New York and Massachusetts, and one a subject of Great Britain, — neither of whom was it pretended had ever set foot on the soil of Georgia. The Milledgeville "Federal Union," a newspaper of Georgia, in 1836, contained an offer of ten thousand dollars for kidnapping a clergyman residing in the city of New York. A Committee of Vigilance in Louisiana, in 1835, offered, in the "Louisiana Journal," fifty thousand dollars to any person who would deliver into their hands Arthur Tappan, a liberty-loving merchant of New York; and during the same year a public meeting in Alabama, with a person entitled "Honorable" in the chair, offered a similar reward of fifty thousand dollars for the apprehension of the same Arthur Tappan, and of La Roy Sunderland, a clergyman of the Methodist Church in New York.

These manifestations are not without example in the history of the Antislavery cause elsewhere. From the beginning, Slave-Masters have encountered argument by brutality and violence. St. Jerome had before him their type, when he described certain persons "whose words are in their fists and syllogisms in their heels."[1] If we go back to the earliest of Abolitionists, the wonderful Portuguese preacher, Vieyra, we find that his matchless eloquence and unquestioned piety did not save him from indignity. The good man was seized and imprisoned, while one of the principal Slave-Masters asked him, in mockery, "where were all his learning and all his genius now, if they could not deliver him in this extremity?"[2] He was of the Catholic Church. But

[1] "Quorum verba in pugnis sunt, et syllogismi in calcibus."

[2] Southey, History of Brazil, Vol. II. ch. 27, p. 536.

the spirit of Slavery is the same in all churches. A renowned Quaker minister of the last century, Thomas Chalkley, while on a visit at Barbadoes, having simply recommended charity to the slaves, without presuming to breathe a word against Slavery itself, was first met by disturbance in the meeting, and afterward, on the highway, in open day, was shot at by one of the exasperated planters, with a fowling-piece "loaded with small shot, ten of which made marks, and several drew blood."[1] In England, while the Slave-Trade was under discussion, the same spirit raged. Wilberforce, who represented the cause of Abolition in Parliament, was threatened with personal violence; Clarkson, who represented the same cause before the people, was assaulted by the infuriate Slave-Traders, and narrowly escaped being hustled into the dock; and Roscoe, the accomplished historian, on return to Liverpool from his seat in Parliament, where he had signalized himself as an opponent of the Slave-Trade, was met at the entrance of the town by a savage mob, composed of persons interested in the traffic, armed with *knives and bludgeons*, the distinctive arguments and companions of the partisans of Slavery.

Even in the Free States, these same partisans from the beginning acted under the inspiration of violence. The demon of Slavery entered into them, and through its influence they have behaved like Slave-Masters. Public meetings for the discussion of Slavery have been interrupted; public halls, dedicated to its discussion, have been destroyed or burned to the ground. In all our populous cities the great rights of speech and of the press have been assailed precisely as in the Slave

[1] Journal of Thomas Chalkley, p. 274.

States. In Boston, an early and most devoted Abolitionist was dragged through the streets with a halter about his neck; and in Illinois, another, while defending his press, was ferociously murdered. The former yet lives to speak for himself, while the latter lives in his eloquent brother, a Representative from Illinois in the other House.[1] Thus does Slavery show its natural character even at a distance.

Nor in the Slave States is this spirit confined to outbreaks of mere lawlessness. Too strong for restraint, it finds no limitations except in its own barbarous will. The Government becomes its tool, and in *official acts* does its bidding. Here again the instances are numerous. I might dwell on the degradation of the Post-Office, when its official head consented that for the sake of Slavery the mails themselves should be rifled. I might dwell also on the cruel persecution of free persons of color, who, in the Slave States generally, and even here in the District of Columbia, are not allowed to testify where a white man is in question, and now in several States are menaced by legislative act with the alternative of expulsion from their homes or of reduction to Slavery. But I pass to two illustrative transactions, which a son of Massachusetts can never forget.

1. The first relates to a citizen of purest life and perfect integrity, whose name is destined to fill a conspicuous place in the history of Freedom, William Lloyd Garrison. Born in Massachusetts, bred to the same profession with Benjamin Franklin, and, like his great predecessor, becoming an editor, he saw with instinctive clearness the wrong of Slavery, and, at a period when

[1] Hon. Owen Lovejoy, who died March 25, 1864.

the ardors of the Missouri Question had given way to indifference throughout the North, he stepped forward to denounce it. The jail at Baltimore, where he then resided, was the earliest reward. Afterward, January 1st, 1831, he published the first number of "The Liberator," inscribing for his motto an utterance of Christian philanthropy, "Our country is the world, our countrymen are mankind," and declaring, in the face of surrounding apathy: "I am in earnest, — I will not equivocate, — I will not excuse, — I will not retreat a single inch, — AND I WILL BE HEARD." In this sublime spirit he commenced his labors for the Slave, proposing no intervention by Congress in the States, and on well-considered principle avoiding all appeals to the bondmen themselves. Such was his simple and thoroughly constitutional position, when, before the expiration of the first year, the Legislature of Georgia, by solemn act, a copy of which I have before me, "approved" by Wilson Lumpkin, Governor, appropriated five thousand dollars "to be paid to any person or persons who shall arrest, bring to trial, and prosecute to conviction under the laws of this State, the editor or publisher of a certain paper called *The Liberator*, published in the town of Boston and State of Massachusetts."[1] This infamous statute, touching a citizen absolutely beyond the jurisdiction of Georgia and in no way amenable to its laws, constituted a plain bribe to the gangs of kidnappers engendered by Slavery. With this barefaced defiance of justice and decency Slave-Masters inaugurated the system of violence by which they have sought to crush every voice raised against Slavery.

[1] Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, 1831, December 26, p. 25¢.

2. Here is another illustration, of a different character. Free persons of color, citizens of Massachusetts, and, according to the institutions of this Commonwealth, entitled to equal privileges with other citizens, being in service as mariners, and touching at the port of Charleston, in South Carolina, have been seized, and, with no allegation against them, except of entering this port in the discharge of their rightful business, have been cast into prison, and there detained during the stay of the vessel. This is by virtue of a statute of South Carolina, passed in 1822, which further declares, that, in the failure of the captain to pay the expenses, these freemen "shall be deemed and taken as absolute slaves," one moiety of the proceeds of their sale to belong to the sheriff. Against all remonstrance, — against the official opinion of Mr. Wirt, as Attorney-General of the United States, declaring it unconstitutional, — against the solemn judgment of Mr. Justice Johnson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, himself a Slave-Master and citizen of South Carolina, also pronouncing it unconstitutional,[1] — this statute, which is an obvious injury to Northern ship-owners, as it is an outrage to the mariners whom it seizes, has been upheld to this day by South Carolina.

Massachusetts, anxious to obtain for her people that protection which was denied, and especially to save them from the dread penalty of being sold into Slavery, appointed a citizen of South Carolina as her agent for this purpose, and in her behalf to bring suits in the Circuit Court of the United States to try the constitutionality of this pretension. Owing to the sensitiveness

[1] Report of Committee of U. S. House of Representatives, 27th Cong. 2d Sess., No. 60, January 20, 1843.

of the people in that State, the agent declined to render this simple service. Massachusetts next selected one of her own sons, a venerable citizen, who had already served with honor in the other House of Congress, and was of admitted eminence as a lawyer, the Hon. Samuel Hoar, of Concord, to visit Charleston, and there do what the agent first appointed shrank from doing. This excellent gentleman, beloved by all who knew him, gentle in manners as he was firm in character, with a countenance that was in itself a letter of recommendation, arrived at Charleston, accompanied only by his daughter. Straightway all South Carolina was convulsed. According to a story in Boswell's Johnson, all the inhabitants at St. Kilda, a remote island of the Hebrides, on the approach of a stranger, "catch cold"[1]; but in South Carolina it is fever that they catch. The Governor at the time, who was none other than one of her present Senators [Mr. HAMMOND], made his arrival the subject of special message to the Legislature, which I have before me; the Legislature all caught the fever, and swiftly adopted resolutions calling upon his Excellency the Governor "to expel from our territory the said agent, after due notice to depart," and promising to "sustain the Executive authority in any measures it may adopt for the purpose aforesaid."

Meanwhile the fever raged in Charleston. The agent of Massachusetts was first accosted in the streets by a person unknown to him, who, flourishing a bludgeon in his hand, — the bludgeon always shows itself where Slavery is in question, — cried out: "You had better be travelling, and the sooner the better for you, I can

[1] Boswell's Life of Johnson, October 2, 1773, ed. Croker, (London, 1835,) Vol. IV. p. 311. See also, anno 1768, Vol. III. pp. 41, 42.

tell you; if you stay here until to-morrow morning, you will feel something you will not like, I 'm thinking." Next came threats of attack during the following night on the hotel where he was lodged; then a request from the landlord that he should quit, in order to preserve the hotel from the impending danger of an infuriate mob; then a committee of Slave-Masters, who politely proposed to conduct him to the boat. Thus arrested in his simple errand of good-will, this venerable public servant, whose appearance alone, like that of the "grave and pious man" mentioned by Virgil, would have softened any mob not inspired by Slavery, yielded to the ejectment proposed, precisely as the prisoner yields to the officers of the law, and left Charleston, while a person in the crowd was heard to declare that he "had offered himself as a leader of a tar-and-feather gang, to have been called into the service of the city on the occasion." Nor is this all. The Legislature a second time caught the fever, and, yielding to its influence, passed a statute, forbidding, under severe penalties, any person within the State from accepting a commission to befriend these colored mariners, and, under penalties severer still, extending even to unlimited imprisonment, prohibiting any person, "on his own behalf, or under color or in virtue of any commission or authority from any State or public authority of any State in this Union, or of any foreign power," to come into South Carolina for this purpose; and then, to complete its work, by still another statute took away the writ of *Habeas Corpus* from all such mariners.[1]

[1] Massachusetts Senate Documents, 1845, No. 4. Acts of the General Assembly of South Carolina, 1844, December 18: Statutes at Large, Vol. XI. pp. 292, 293.

Such is a simple narrative, founded on authentic documents. I do not adduce it for present criticism, but simply to enroll it in all its stages — beginning with the earliest pretension of South Carolina, continuing in violence, and ending in yet other pretensions — among the special instances where the Barbarism of Slavery stands confessed even in official conduct. And yet this transaction, which may well give to South Carolina the character of a shore "where shipwrecked mariners dread to land," was openly vindicated in all its details, from beginning to end, by both the Senators from that State, while one of them [Mr. HAMMOND], in the same breath, bore testimony from personal knowledge to the character of the public agent thus maltreated, saying, "He was a pleasant, kind old gentleman, well informed, and I had a sort of friendship for him during the short time that I sat near him in Congress."[1]

Thus, Sir, whether we look at individuals or at the community where Slavery exists, at lawless outbreaks or at official conduct, Slave-Masters are always the same. Enough, you will say, has been told. Yes, enough to expose Slavery, but not enough for Truth. The most instructive and most grievous part still remains. It is the exhibition of Slave-Masters in Congressional history. Of course, the representative reflects the character as well as the political opinions of the constituents whose will it is his boast to obey. It follows that the passions and habits of Slave-Masters are naturally represented in Congress, — chastened to a certain extent, perhaps, by the requirements of Parliamentary Law, but breaking out in fearful examples. And here, again, facts speak as nothing else can.

[1] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 595, January 26, 1860.

In proceeding with this duty, to which, as you will perceive, I am impelled by the positive requirements of this debate, I crave indulgence of the Senate, while, avoiding all allusions to private life or private character, and touching simply what is of record, and already "enrolled in the Capitol," I present a few only of many instances, which, especially during these latter days, since Slavery became paramount, have taken their place in our national history. Clarendon has mildly pictured successive Congresses, when, recounting what preceded the Civil War in England, he says: "It is not to be denied that there were in all those Parliaments .... several passages and distempered speeches of particular persons, not fit for the dignity and honor of those places."[1] But Congress, under the rule of Slavery, has been worse than any Parliament.

Here is an instance. On the 13th of February, 1837, R. M. Whitney was arraigned before the House of Representatives for contempt, in refusing to attend, when required, before a committee investigating the administration of the Executive office. His excuse was, that "he could not attend without exposing himself thereby to outrage and violence" in the committee-room; and on examination at the bar of the House, Mr. Fairfield, a member of the Committee, afterward a member of this body, and Governor of Maine, testified to the actual facts. It appeared that Mr. Peyton, a Slave-Master from Tennessee, and a member of the Committee, regarding a certain answer in writing by Mr. Whitney to an interrogatory propounded by him as offensive, broke out in these words: "Mr. Chairman, I wish you to inform this witness that he is not to insult me in his

[1] History of the Rebellion, Book I. Vol. I. pp. 8, 9, Oxford, 1826.

answers; if he does, God damn him, I will take his life upon the spot!" Mr. Wise, another Slave-Master, from Virginia, Chairman of the Committee, and latterly Governor of Virginia, then intervened, saying, "Yes, this damned insolence is insufferable." The witness, thereupon rising, claimed the protection of the Committee; on which Mr. Peyton exclaimed: "God damn you, you shan't speak; you shan't say a word while you are in this room; if you do, I will put you to death!" Soon after, Mr. Peyton, observing that the witness was looking at him, cried out: "Damn him, his eyes are on me; God damn him, he is looking at me; he shan't do it; damn him, he shan't look at me!" These things, and much more, disclosed by Mr. Fairfield, in reply to interrogatories in the House, were confirmed by other witnesses; and Mr. Wise himself, in a speech, made the admission that he was armed with deadly weapons, saying: "I watched the motion of that right arm [of the witness], the elbow of which could be seen by me; and had it moved one inch, he had died on the spot. That was my determination."

All this will be found in the thirteenth volume of the "Congressional Debates," with the evidence in detail, and the discussion thereupon.

Here is another instance, of similar character, which did not occur in a committee-room, but during debate in the Senate Chamber. While the Compromise Measures were under discussion, on the 17th of April, 1850, Mr. Foote, a Slave-Master from Mississippi, in the course of remarks, commenced personal allusion to Mr. Benton. This was aggravated by the circumstance that only a few days previously he had made this distinguished gentleman the mark for most bitter and vin-

dictive personalities. Mr. Benton rose at once from his seat, and, with angry countenance, but without weapon of any kind in his hand, or, as appeared afterward before the Committee, on his person, advanced in the direction of Mr. Foote, when the latter, gliding backward, drew from his pocket a five-chambered revolver, full-loaded, which he cocked. Meanwhile Mr. Benton, at the suggestion of friends, was already returning to his seat, when he perceived the pistol. Excited greatly by this deadly menace, he exclaimed: "I am not armed. I have no pistols. I disdain to carry arms. Stand out of the way, and let the assassin fire." Mr. Foote remained standing in the position he had taken, with pistol in hand, cocked. "Soon after," says the Report of the Committee appointed to investigate this occurrence, "both Senators resumed their seats, and order was restored."

This will be found at length in the twenty-first volume of the "Congressional Globe." [1]

I cite yet another instance from the same authentic record. Mr. Arnold, of Tennessee, had proclaimed himself as "belonging to the Peace party," when Mr. Dawson, of Louisiana, coming to his seat, called him "a damned coward," "a damned blackguard," and then said, that, if Mr. Arnold did not behave better, "he would cut his throat from ear to ear." [2]

The Duel, which at home in the Slave States is "twin" with the "street fight," is also "twin" with these instances. It is constantly adopted or attempted by Slave-Masters in Congress. But I shall not enter

[1] See also Senate Reports, 31st Cong. 1st Sess., No. 170.

[2] Speech of Mr. Arnold, January 27, 1841: Congressional Globe, Vol. XI. p. 182. See also Address to the Inhabitants of New Mexico and California, by William Jay: Miscellaneous Writings, p. 515.

upon this catalogue. I content myself with showing the openness with which it has been menaced in debate, and without any call to order.

Mr. Foote, the same Slave-Master already mentioned, in debate in the Senate, the 26th of March, 1850, thus sought to provoke Mr. Benton. I take his words from the "Congressional Globe," Vol. XXI. p. 603.

"There are incidents in his [Mr. Benton's] history, of somewhat recent occurrence, which might well relieve any man of honor from the obligation to recognize him as a fitting antagonist; yet is it, notwithstanding, true, that, if the Senator from Missouri will deign to acknowledge himself *responsible to the laws of honor*, he shall have a very early opportunity of proving his prowess in contest with one over whom I hold perfect control; or, if he feels in the least degree aggrieved at anything which has fallen from me, now or formerly, he shall, on demanding it, *have full redress accorded him*, according to the said laws of honor. I do not denounce him as a coward; such language is unfitted for this audience; but, if he wishes to patch up his reputation for courage, now greatly on the wane, he will certainly *have an opportunity of doing so, whenever he makes known his desire in the premises.* At present he is shielded by his age, *his open disavowal of the obligatory force of the laws of honor*, and his Senatorial privileges."

With such bitter taunts and reiterated provocations to the Duel was Mr. Benton pursued; but there was no call to order, nor any action of the Senate on this outrage.

I give another instance. In debate in the Senate on the 27th February, 1852, Mr. Clemens, a Slave-Master of Alabama, thus directly attacked Mr. Rhett for undertaking to settle their differences by argument in the Senate rather than by the Duel. "No man,"

said he, "with the feeling of a man in his bosom, would have sought redress here. He would have looked for it *elsewhere*. He now comes here, not to ask redress in the only way he should have sought it."[1] There was no call to order.

Here is still another. In the debate on the Bill for the Improvement of Rivers and Harbors, 29th July, 1854, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN], who is still a member of this body, ardent for Slavery, while professing to avoid personal altercation in the Senate, especially "with a gentleman who professes the principles of non-resistance, as he understood the Senator from New York does," proceeded most earnestly to repel an imagined imputation on him by Mr. Seward, and wound up by saying, "If it came from another quarter, *it would not be upon this floor that I should answer it.*"[2]

During the present session, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS], who speaks so often for Slavery, in a colloquy on this floor with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. COLLAMER], maintained the Duel as a mode of settling personal differences, and vindicating what is called personal honor, — as if personal honor did not depend absolutely upon what a man does, and not on what is done to him. After certain refinements on the imagined relations between an insult and the obligation to answer for it, the Senator declared, in reply to the Senator from Vermont, that, in case of insult, taking another out and shooting him might be "satisfaction."[3]

I do not dwell on this instance, nor on any of these

[1] Congressional Globe, 32d Cong. 1st Sess., p. 647.
[2] Ibid., 33d Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 1168.
[3] Ibid., 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 1686.

instances, except to make a single comment. These declarations have all been made in open Senate, without any check from the Chair. Of course, they are clear violations of the first principles of Parliamentary Law, and tend directly to provoke a violation of the law of the land. Here, in the District of Columbia, all duels are prohibited by solemn Act of Congress.[1] In case of death, the surviving parties are declared guilty of felony, to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary; and even where nothing has occurred beyond the challenge, all the parties to it, whether givers, receivers, or bearers, are declared guilty of high crime and misdemeanor, also to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary. Of course, every menace of duel in Congress sets this law at defiance. And yet Senators, who thus openly disregard a law sanctioned by the Constitution and commended by morality, presume to complain on this floor because other Senators disregard the Fugitive Slave Bill, a statute which, according to the profound convictions of large numbers, is as unconstitutional as it is offensive to the moral sense. Let Senators, whose watchword is "the enforcement of laws," begin by enforcing the statute which declares the Duel to be felony. At least, let the statute cease to be a dead letter in this Chamber, where the watchword is so often heard. But this is too much to expect while Slavery prevails here; for the Duel is part of that System of Violence which has its origin in Slavery.

It is when aroused by the Slave Question in Congress that Slave-Masters have most truly shown themselves; and here again I shall speak only of what has already passed into history. Slavery is a perpetual

[1] Act of February 20, 1839: Statutes at Large, Vol. V. p. 316.

fever-and-ague, under which Congress has shaken with alternate heats and chills. Even in that earliest debate, in the first Congress after the Constitution, on the memorial of Dr. Franklin, simply calling upon Congress to "step to the verge of its power to discourage every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow-men," [1] the Slave-Masters became angry, indulged in sneers at "the men in the gallery" being Quakers and Abolitionists, and, according to the faithful historian, Hildreth,[2] poured out "torrents of abuse," while one of them began the charge so often since directed against all Antislavery men, by declaring his astonishment that Dr. Franklin had "given countenance" to "an application which called upon Congress, in explicit terms, to break a solemn compact to which he had himself been a party," when it was obvious that Dr. Franklin had done no such thing. The great man was soon summoned away by death, but not until he had fastened upon this debate an undying condemnation, by portraying, with matchless pen, a scene in the Divan at Algiers, where a Corsair Slave-Dealer, insisting upon the enslavement of White Christians, is made to repeat the Congressional speech of an American Slave-Master.[3]

These displays of Violence naturally increase with the intensity of the discussion. Impelled to be severe, but with little appreciation of debate in its finer forms, they cannot be severe except by violating the rules of debate, — not knowing that there is a serener power than any found in personalities, and that all severity transcending the rules of debate becomes disgusting as the utterance of a Yahoo, and harms him only who

[1] Annals of Congress, 1st Cong. 2d Sess., col. 1198.
[2] History of the United States, Vol. IV. Ch. 2.
[3] Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. II. pp. 517-521.

degrades himself to be its mouthpiece. Of course, on such occasions, amidst all seeming triumphs, the cause of Slavery loses, and Truth gains. If men cannot afford to be decent, they ought to suspect the justice of their cause, or at least the motives with which they sustain it; but our Slave-Masters, not seeing the indecency of their conduct, know not their losses. There is waste as well as economy of character; but the latter is found only in the cultivation of those principles which make Slavery impossible.

Against John Quincy Adams this violence was first directed in full force. To a character spotless as snow, and to universal attainments as a scholar, this illustrious citizen added experience in all the eminent posts of the Republic, which he had filled with an ability and integrity now admitted even by enemies, and which impartial history can never forget. Having been President of the United States, he entered the House of Representatives at the period when the Slave Question, in its revival, first began to occupy public attention. In all the completeness of his nature, he became the representative of Human Freedom. The first struggle occurred on the Right of Petition, which Slave-Masters, with characteristic tyranny, sought to suppress. This was resisted by the venerable patriot, and what he did was always done with his whole heart. Then was poured upon him abuse "as from a cart," according to a famous phrase of Demosthenes. Slave-Masters, "foaming out their shame," became conspicuous, not less for the avowal of sentiments at which Civilization blushed than for an effrontery of manner where the accidental legislator was lost in the natural overseer, and the lash of the plantation resounded in the voice.

In an address to his constituents, September 17, 1842, Mr. Adams thus frankly describes the treatment he experienced: —

"I never can take part in any debate upon an important subject, be it only upon a mere abstraction, but a pack opens upon me of personal invective in return. Language has no word of reproach and railing that is not hurled at me."

And in the same speech he shows us Slave-Masters: —

"Where the South cannot effect her object by browbeating, she wheedles."

On another occasion, he announced, with accustomed power: —

"Insult, bullying, and threat characterize the Slaveholders in Congress; talk, timidity, and submission, the Representatives from the Free States."

Nor were the Slave-Masters content with violence of words, or with ejaculation of personalities by which debate became a perpetual syringe of liquid foulness, and every one seemed to vie with Squirt the apothecary, according to the verse admired by Pope, —

"Such zeal he had for that vile utensil." [1]

True to the instincts of Slavery, they threatened personal indignity of every kind, and even assassination. And here South Carolina naturally took the lead.

The "Charleston Mercury," which always speaks the true voice of Slavery, said in 1837: —

"Public opinion in the South would now, we are sure, justify an immediate resort to force by the Southern dele-

[1] Garth, The Dispensary, Canto II. 228.

gation, *even on the floor of Congress*, were they forthwith to seize and drag from the Hall any man who dared to insult them, as that eccentric old showman, John Quincy Adams, has dared to do."

And at a public dinner at Walterborough, in South Carolina, on the 4th of July, 1842, the following toast, afterwards preserved by Mr. Adams in one of his speeches, was drunk with unbounded applause:—

"May we never want a Democrat to trip up the heels of a Federalist, or a hangman to prepare a halter for John Quincy Adams! [*Nine cheers.*]"

A Slave-Master from South Carolina, Mr. Waddy Thompson, in debate in the House of Representatives, threatened the venerable patriot with the "penitentiary"; and another Slave-Master, Mr. Marshall, of Kentucky, insisted that he should be "*silenced.*" Ominous word! full of incentive to the bludgeon-bearers of Slavery. But the great representative of Freedom stood firm. Meanwhile Slavery assumed more and more the port of Giant Maul in "Pilgrim's Progress," who continued with his club breaking skulls, until he was slain by Mr. Great-Heart, soon to join the congenial pilgrims, Mr. Honest, Mr. Valiant-for-Truth, and Mr. Standfast.

Next to John Quincy Adams, no person in Congress has been more conspicuous for long-continued and patriotic services against Slavery than Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio; nor have any such services received in higher degree that homage found in the personal and most vindictive assaults of Slave-Masters. For more than twenty years he sat in the House of Representatives, bearing his testimony austerely, and never shrinking,

though exposed to the grossest brutality. In a recent address at New York he has recounted some of these instances.

On his presentation of resolutions affirming that Slavery was a local institution and could not exist outside of the Slave States, and applying this principle to the case of the "Creole," the House caught the South Carolina fever. A proposition of censure was introduced by Slave-Masters, and under the previous question pressed to a vote, without giving him a moment for explanation or reply. This glaring outrage upon freedom of debate was redressed by the constituency of Mr. Giddings, who without delay returned him to his seat. From that time the rage of the Slave-Masters against him was constant. Here is his own brief account.

"I will not speak of the time when Dawson, of Louisiana, drew a bowie-knife for my assassination. I was afterward speaking with regard to a certain transaction in which negroes were concerned in Georgia, when Mr. Black, of Georgia, raising his bludgeon, and standing in front of my seat, said to me, 'If you repeat that language again, I will knock you down.' It was a solemn moment for me. I had never been knocked down, and, having some curiosity upon that subject, I repeated the language. Then Mr. Dawson, of Louisiana, the same who had drawn the bowie-knife, placed his hand in his pocket and said, with an oath which I will not repeat, that he would shoot me, at the same time cocking the pistol, so that all around me could hear it click."

Listening to these horrors, ancient stories of Barbarism are all outdone; and the "viper broth," which was a favorite decoction in a barbarous age, seems to be the daily drink of American Slave-Masters. The blas-

pheming madness of the witches in "Macbeth" is renewed, and they dance again round the caldron, dropping into it "sweltered venom sleeping got," with every other "charm of powerful trouble." Men are transformed into wolves, as according to early Greek superstition, and a new lycanthropy has its day. But Mr. Giddings, strong in consciousness of right, knew the dignity of his position. He knew that it is always honorable to serve the cause of Liberty, and that it is a privilege to suffer for this cause. Reproach, contumely, violence even unto death, are rewards, not punishments; and clearly the indignities you offer can excite no shame except for their authors.

Besides these eminent instances, others may be mentioned, showing the personalities to which Senators and Representatives are exposed, when undertaking to speak for Freedom. And truth compels me to add, that it would be easy to show how these are grossly aggravated towards individuals who notoriously reject the Duel; for then they can be offered with personal impunity.

Here is an instance. In 1848, Mr. Hale, the Senator from New Hampshire, who still continues an honor to this body, introduced into the Senate a bill for the protection of property in the District of Columbia, especially against mob-violence, when, in the debate that ensued, Mr. Foote, a Slave-Master from Mississippi, thus menaced him:—

"I invite the Senator to the good State of Mississippi, and will tell him beforehand, in all honesty, that he could not go ten miles into the interior before he would grace one of the tallest trees of the forest with a rope around his neck, with the approbation of every virtuous and patriotic citizen, and that, if necessary, *I should myself assist in the operation.*" [1]

[1] Congressional Globe, 30th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p, 502.

That this bloody threat may not seem to stand alone, I add two others.

In 1836, Mr. Hammond, of South Carolina, now a Senator, is reported as saying in the House of Representatives: —

"I warn the Abolitionists, ignorant, infatuated barbarians as they are, that, if chance shall throw any of them into our hands, he may expect *a felon's death!*" [1]

In 1841, Mr. Payne, a Slave-Master from Alabama, in the course of debate in the House of Representatives, alluding to the Abolitionists, among whom he insisted the Postmaster-General ought to be included, declared that

"He would put the brand of Cain upon them, — yes, the mark of Hell; and if they came to the South, he would *hang them like dogs.*" [2]

And these words were applied to men who simply expressed the recorded sentiments of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

Even during the present session of Congress, I find in the "Congressional Globe" the following interruptions of the eloquent and faithful Representative from Illinois, Mr. Lovejoy, when speaking on Slavery. I do not characterize them, but simply cite the language.

By Mr. Barksdale, of Mississippi: —

"Order that black-hearted scoundrel and nigger-stealing thief to take his seat."

By Mr. Boyce, of South Carolina, addressing Mr. Lovejoy: —

"Then behave yourself."

[1] Congressional Globe, 24th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 567.
[2] Ibid., 27th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 387.

By Mr. Gartrell, of Georgia (in his seat): —

"The man is crazy."

By Mr. Barksdale, of Mississippi, again: —

"No, Sir, you stand there to-day an infamous, perjured villain."

By Mr. Ashmore, of South Carolina: —

"Yes, he is a perjured villain; and he perjures himself every hour he occupies a seat on this floor."

By Mr. Singleton, of Mississippi: —

"And a negro-thief into the bargain."

By Mr. Barksdale, of Mississippi, again: —

"I hope my colleague will hold no parley with that perjured negro-thief."

By Mr. Singleton, of Mississippi, again: —

"No, Sir! any gentleman shall have time, but not such a mean, despicable wretch as that!"

By Mr. Martin, of Virginia: —

"And if you come among us, we will do with you as we did with John Brown, — hang you up as high as Haman. I say that as a Virginian."[1]

But enough, — enough; and I now turn from this branch of the great subject with a single remark. While exhibiting the Character of Slave-Masters, these numerous instances — and they might be multiplied indefinitely — attest the weakness of their cause. It requires no special talent to estimate the insignificance of an argument that can be supported only by violence. The scholar will not forget the ancient story of the collo-

[1] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, pp. 203 - 207.

quy between Jupiter and a simple countryman. They talked with ease and freedom until they differed, when the angry god at once menaced his honest opponent with a thunderbolt. "Ah! ah!" said the clown, with perfect composure, "now, Jupiter, I know you are wrong. You are always wrong, when you appeal to your thunder." And permit me to say, that every appeal, whether to the Duel, the revolver, or the bludgeon, every menace of personal violence and every outrage of language, besides disclosing a hideous Barbarism, also discloses the fevered nervousness of a cause already humbled in debate. And then how impotent! Truth, like the sunbeam, cannot be soiled by outward touch, while the best testimony to its might is found in the active passions it provokes. There are occasions when enmity is a panegyric.

(4.) Much as has been said to exhibit the Character of Slave-Masters, the work would be incomplete, if I failed to point out that *unconsciousness* of its fatal influence which completes the evidence of the Barbarism under which they live. Nor am I at liberty to decline this topic; but I shall be brief.

That Senators should seriously declare Slavery "ennobling," at least to the master, and "the black marble keystone of our national arch," would excite wonder, if it were not explained by examples of history. There are men who, in the spirit of paradox, make themselves partisans of a bad cause, as Jerome Cardan wrote an Encomium on Nero. But where there is no disposition to paradox, it is natural that a cherished practice should blind those under its influence; nor is there any end to these exaggerations. According to Thu-

cydides, piracy in the early ages of Greece was alike wide-spread and honorable; and so much was this the case, that Telemachus and Mentor, on landing at Pylos, were asked by Nestor if they were "pirates," [1] — precisely as in South Carolina the stranger might be asked if he were a Slave-Master. Kidnapping, too, a kindred indulgence, was openly avowed, and I doubt not held to be "ennobling." Next to the unconsciousness of childhood is the unconsciousness of Barbarism. The real Barbarian is unconscious as an infant; and the Slave-Master shows much of the same character. No New-Zealander exults in his tattoo, no savage of the Northwest Coast exults in his flat head, more than the Slave-Master of these latter days — always, of course, with honorable exceptions — exults in his unfortunate condition. The Slave-Master hugs his disgusting practice as the Carib of the Gulf hugged Cannibalism, and as Brigham Young now hugs Polygamy. The delusion of the Goitre is repeated. This prodigious swelling of the neck, nothing less than a loathsome wallet of flesh pendulous upon the breast, and sometimes so enormous, that the victim, unable to support the burden, crawls along the ground, is common to the population on the slopes of the Alps; [2] but, accustomed to this deformity, the sufferer comes to regard it with pride, — as Slave-Masters with us, unable to support their burden, and crawling along the ground, regard Slavery, — and it is said that those who have no swelling are laughed at and called "goose-necked." [3]

[1] Thucydides, Hist. Belli Pelop., Lib. I. cap. 5. Odyssey, III. 73.

[2] "Quis tumidum guttur miratur in Alpibus?" — JUVENAL, *Sat. XIII.* 162.

[3] Murray's Handbook for Travellers in Switzerland, 8th ed., Introduction. § 18.

With knowledge comes distrust and the modest consciousness of imperfection; but the pride of Barbarism has no such limitation. It dilates in the thin air of ignorance, and makes boasts. Surely, if the illustrations which I have presented to-day are not entirely inapplicable, then must we find in the boasts of Slave-Masters new occasion to regret that baleful influence under which even love of country is lost in love of Slavery, and the great motto of Franklin is reversed, so as to read, *Ubi Servitudo, ibi Patria.*

It is this same influence which renders Slave-Masters insensible to those characters which are among the true glories of the Republic, — which makes them forget that Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, and Washington, who commanded our armies, were Abolitionists, — which renders them indifferent to the inspiring words of the one and the commanding example of the other. Of these great men it is the praise, well deserving perpetual mention, and grudged only by malign influence, that, reared amidst Slavery, they did not hesitate to condemn it. Jefferson, in repeated utterances, alive with the fire of genius and truth, has contributed the most important testimony to Freedom ever pronounced in this hemisphere, in words equal to the cause; and Washington, often quoted as a Slave-Master, in the solemn dispositions of his last will and testament, has contributed an example which is beyond even the words of Jefferson. Do not, Sir, call him Slave-Master, who entered into the presence of his Maker only as Emancipator of his slaves. The difference between such men and the Slave-Masters whom I expose to-day is so precise that it cannot be mistaken. The first *looked down* upon Slavery; the second *look up* to

Slavery. The first, recognizing its wrong, were at once liberated from its insidious influence; while the latter, upholding it as right and "ennobling," must naturally draw from it motives of conduct. The first, conscious of the character of Slavery, were not misled by it; the second, dwelling in unconsciousness of its true character, surrender blindly to its barbarous tendencies, and, verifying the words of the poet, —

> "So perfect is their misery,
> Not once perceive their foul disfigurement,
> But boast themselves more comely than before." [1]

Mr. President, it is time to close this branch of the argument. The Barbarism of Slavery has been exposed, first, in the Law of Slavery, with its five pretensions, founded on the assertion of property in man, the denial of the conjugal relation, the infraction of the parental tie, the exclusion from knowledge, and the robbery of the fruits of another's labor, all these having the single object of *compelling men to work without wages*, while its Barbarism was still further attested by tracing the law in its origin to barbarous Africa; and, secondly, it has been exposed in a careful examination of economical results, illustrated by contrast between the Free States and the Slave States, sustained by official figures. From this exposure I proceeded to consider the influence on Slave-Masters, whose true character stands confessed, — first, in the Law of Slavery, which is their work, — next, in the relations between them and their slaves, maintained by three inhuman instruments, — then, in their intercourse with each other and with society: and here we have seen them at

[1] Milton, Comus, 73–75.

home, under the immediate influence of Slavery, also in the communities of which they are a part, practising violence, and pushing it everywhere, in street-fight and duel; especially raging against all who question the pretensions of Slavery, entering even into the Free States, — but not in lawless outbreaks only, also in official acts, as of Georgia and of South Carolina regarding two Massachusetts citizens, — and then, ascending in audacity, entering the Halls of Congress, where they have turned, as at home, against all who oppose their assumptions; while the whole gloomy array of unquestionable facts is closed by the melancholy unconsciousness which constitutes one of the distinctive features of this Barbarism.

Such is my answer to the assumption of fact in behalf of Slavery by Senators on the other side. But before passing to that other assumption of Constitutional Law, which forms the second branch of this discussion, I add testimony to the influence of Slavery on Slave-Masters in other countries, which is too important to be neglected, and may properly find place here.

Among those who have done most to press forward in Russia that sublime act of emancipation by which the present Emperor is winning lustre, not only for his own country, but for our age, is M. Tourgueneff. Originally a Slave-Master himself, with numerous slaves, and residing where Slavery prevailed, he saw, with the instincts of a noble character, the essential Barbarism of this relation, and in an elaborate work on Russia, which is now before me, exposed it with rare ability and courage. Thus he speaks of its influence on Slave-Masters: —

"But if Slavery degrades the slave, it degrades the master more. This is an old adage, and long observation has proved to me that this adage is not a paradox. In fact, how can that man respect his own dignity, his own rights, who has not learned to respect either the rights or the dignity of his fellow-man? What control can the moral and religious sentiments have over a person who sees himself invested with a power so eminently contrary to morality and religion? The continual exercise of an unjust claim, even when moderated, ends in corrupting the character of the man, and perverting his judgment. . . . . The possession of a slave being the result of injustice, the relations of the master with the slave cannot be otherwise than a succession of wrongs. Among good masters (and it is agreed so to call those who do not abuse their power as much as they might) these relations are invested with forms less repugnant than among other masters; but here the difference ends. Who can remain always pure, when, induced by disposition, excited by temper, influenced by caprice, he may with impunity oppress, insult, humiliate his fellow-men? And be it remarked, that enlightenment, civilization, do not avail here. The enlightened man, the civilized man, is nevertheless a man; that he may not oppress, it is necessary that it should be impossible for him to oppress. All men cannot, like Louis the Fourteenth, throw the cane out of the window, when they feel an inclination to strike."[1]

Another authority, unimpeachable at all points, whose fortune it has been, from extensive travels, to see Slavery in the most various forms, and Slave-Masters under the most various conditions, — I refer to the great African traveller, Dr. Livingstone, — thus touches the character of Slave-Masters: —

"I can never cease to be most unfeignedly thankful that I was not born in a land of slaves. No one can under-

[1] La Russie et Les Russes, Tom. II. pp. 157, 158.

stand the effect of the unutterable meanness of the slave system on the minds of those who, *but for the strange obliquity which prevents them from feeling the degradation of not being gentlemen enough to pay for services rendered*, would be equal in virtue to ourselves. Fraud becomes as natural to them as 'paying one's way' is to the rest of mankind."[1]

And so does the experience of Slavery in other countries confirm the sad experience among us.

Second Assumption of Slave-Masters.

Discarding now all presumptuous boasts for Slavery, and bearing in mind its essential Barbarism, I come to consider that second assumption of Senators on the other side, which is, of course, inspired by the first, even if not its immediate consequence, that, under the Constitution, Slave-Masters may take their slaves into the National Territories, and there continue to hold them, as at home in the Slave States, — and that this would be the case in any territory newly acquired, by purchase or by war, as of Mexico on the South or Canada on the North.

Here I begin with the remark, that, as the assumption of Constitutional Law is inspired by the assumption of fact with regard to the "ennobling" character of Slavery, so it must lose much, if not all of its force, when the latter assumption is shown to be false, as has been done to-day.

When Slavery is seen to be the Barbarism which it is, there are few who would not cover it from sight, rather than insist upon sending it abroad with the flag

[1] Missionary Travels, Chap. II. p. 89.

of the Republic. Only because people have been insensible to its true character have they tolerated for a moment its exorbitant pretensions. Therefore this long exposition, where Slavery stands forth in fivefold Barbarism, with the single object of compelling men to work without wages, naturally prepares the way to consider the assumption of Constitutional Law.

This assumption may be described as an attempt to *Africanize* the Constitution, by introducing into it the barbarous Law of Slavery, originally derived, as we have seen, from barbarous Africa, — and then, through such *Africanization* of the Constitution, to *Africanize* the Territories, and *Africanize* the National Government. In using this language to express the obvious effect of this assumption, I borrow a suggestive term, first employed by a Portuguese writer at the beginning of this century, when protesting against the spread of Slavery in Brazil.[1] Analyze the assumption, and it is found to stand on two pretensions, either of which failing, the assumption fails also. These two are, first, the peculiar African pretension of property in man, — and, secondly, the pretension that such property is recognized in the Constitution.

With regard to the first of these pretensions, I might simply refer to what has been said at an earlier stage of this argument. But I should do injustice to the part it plays in this controversy, if I did not again notice it. Then I sought particularly to show its Barbarism ; now I shall show something more.

Property implies an owner and a thing owned. On the one side is a human being, and on the other side a thing. But the very idea of a human being necessarily

[1] Koster, Travels in Brazil, p. 449.

excludes the idea of property in that being, just as the very idea of a thing necessarily excludes the idea of a human being. It is clear that a thing cannot be a human being, and it is equally clear that a human being cannot be a thing. And the law itself, when it adopts the phrase, "relation of master and slave," confesses its reluctance to sanction the claim of property. It shrinks from the pretension of Senators, and satisfies itself with a formula which does not openly degrade human nature.

If this property does exist, out of what title is it derived? Under what ordinance of Nature or of Nature's God is one human being stamped an owner and another stamped a thing? God is no respecter of persons. Where is the sanction for this respect of certain persons to a degree which becomes outrage to other persons? God is the Father of the Human Family, and we all are his children. Where, then, is the sanction of this pretension by which a brother lays violent hands upon a brother? To ask these questions is humiliating; but it is clear there can be but one response. There is no sanction for such pretension, no ordinance for it, no title. On all grounds of reason, and waiving all questions of "positive" statute, the Vermont Judge was nobly right, when, rejecting the claim of a Slave-Master, he said, "No, not until you show a Bill of Sale from the Almighty." Nothing short of this impossible link in the chain of title would do. I know something of the great judgments by which the jurisprudence of our country is illustrated; but I doubt if there is anything in the wisdom of Marshall, the learning of Story, or the completeness of Kent, which will brighten with time like this honest decree.

The intrinsic feebleness of this pretension is apparent in the intrinsic feebleness of the arguments by which it is maintained. These are twofold, and both were put forth in recent debate by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS].

The first is the alleged inferiority of the African race,— an argument instructive to the Slave-Master. The law of life is labor. Slavery is a perpetual effort to evade this law by compelling the labor of others; and such an attempt at evasion is naturally supported by the pretension, that, because the African is inferior, therefore he may be enslaved. But this pretension, while surrendering to Slavery a whole race, leaves it uncertain whether the same principle may not be applied to other races, as to the polished Japanese who are now the guests of the nation,[1] and even to persons of obvious inferiority among the white race. Indeed, the latter pretension is openly set up in other quarters. The "Richmond Enquirer," a leading journal of Slave-Masters, declares, "The principle of Slavery is in itself right, and *does not depend on difference of complexion.*" And a leading writer among Slave-Masters, George Fitzhugh, of Virginia, in his "Sociology for the South," declares, "Slavery, *black or white,* is right and necessary. Nature has made the weak in mind or body for slaves." In the same vein, a Democratic paper of South Carolina has said, "Slavery is the natural and normal condition of the laboring man, *black or white.*"

These more extravagant pretensions reveal still further the feebleness of the pretension put forth by the

[1] A considerable embassy with a numerous suite was received at Washington about this time.

Senator, while instances, accumulating constantly, attest the difficulty of discriminating between the two races. Mr. Paxton, of Virginia, tells us that "the best blood in Virginia flows in the veins of the slaves"; and more than one fugitive has been advertised latterly as possessing "a round face," "blue eyes," "flaxen hair," and as "escaping under the pretence of being a white man."

This is not the time to enter upon the great question of race, in the various lights of religion, history, and science. Sure I am that they who understand it best will be least disposed to the pretension which, on an assumed ground of inferiority, would condemn one race to be the property of another. If the African race be inferior, as is alleged, then unquestionably a Christian Civilization must lift it from degradation, not by the lash and the chain, not by this barbarous pretension of ownership, but by a generous charity, which shall be measured precisely by the extent of inferiority.

The second argument put forward for this pretension, and twice repeated by the Senator from Mississippi, is, that the Africans are the posterity of Ham, the son of Noah, through Canaan, who was cursed by Noah, to be the "servant" — that is the word employed — of his brethren, and that this malediction has fallen upon all his descendants, who are accordingly devoted by God to perpetual bondage, not only in the third and fourth generations, but throughout all succeeding time. Surely, when the Senator quoted Scripture to enforce the claim of Slave-Masters, he did not intend a jest. And yet it is hard to suppose him in earnest. The Senator is Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, where he is doubtless experienced. He may, perhaps,

set a squadron in the field; but, evidently, he has considered very little the text of Scripture on which he relies. The Senator assumes that it has fixed the doom of the colored race, leaving untouched the white race. Perhaps he does not know, that, in the worst days of the Polish aristocracy, this same argument was adopted as excuse for holding white serfs in bondage, precisely as it is now put forward by the Senator, and that even to this day the angry Polish noble addresses his white peasant as "Son of Ham."

It hardly comports with the gravity of this debate to dwell on such an argument; and yet I cannot go wrong, if, for the sake of a much injured race, I brush it away. To justify the Senator in his application of this ancient curse, he must maintain at least five different propositions, as essential links in the chain of the Afric-American slave: *first*, that by this malediction Canaan himself was actually changed into a "chattel," — whereas he is simply made the "servant" of his brethren; *secondly*, that not merely Canaan, but all his posterity, to the remotest generation, was so changed, — whereas the language has no such extent; *thirdly*, that the Afric-American actually belongs to the posterity of Canaan, — an ethnological assumption absurdly difficult to establish; *fourthly*, that each of the descendants of Shem and Japheth has a right to hold an Afric-American fellowman as a "chattel," — a proposition which finds no semblance of support; and, *fifthly*, that every Slave-Master is truly descended from Shem or Japheth, — a pedigree which no anxiety can establish. This plain analysis, which may fitly excite a smile, shows the fivefold absurdity of an attempt to found this pretension on any

"successive title, long and dark,
Drawn from the mouldy rolls of Noah's ark." [1]

From the character of these two arguments for property in man, I am brought to its denial.

It is natural that Senators who pretend, that, by the Law of Nature, man may hold property in man, should find this pretension in the Constitution. But the pretension is as much without foundation in the Constitution as it is without foundation in Nature. It is not too much to say that there is not one sentence, phrase, or word, not a single suggestion, hint, or equivocation, even, out of which any such pretension can be implied,— while great national acts and important contemporaneous declarations in the Convention which framed the Constitution, in different forms of language, and also controlling rules of interpretation, render this pretension impossible. Partisans, taking counsel of their desires, find in the Constitution, as in the Scriptures, what they incline to find; and never was this more apparent than when Slave-Masters deceive themselves so far as to find in the Constitution a pretension which exists only in their own minds.

Looking for one moment juridically at this question, we are brought to the conclusion, according to the admission of courts and jurists, first in Europe, and then in our own country, that Slavery can be derived from no doubtful word or mere pretension, but only from clear and special recognition. "The state of Slavery," said Lord Mansfield, pronouncing judgment in the great case of Somerset, "is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political, but

[1] Dryden, Absalom and Achitophel, Part I. 301, 302.

only by *positive law*. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but POSITIVE LAW," — that is, express words of a written text; and this principle, which commends itself to the enlightened reason, is adopted by several courts in the Slave States. Of course every leaning must be against Slavery. A pretension so peculiar and offensive, so hostile to reason, so repugnant to the Laws of Nature and the inborn Rights of Man, which, in all its fivefold wrong, has no other object than to compel fellow-men to work without wages, — such a pretension, so tyrannical, so unjust, so mean, so barbarous, can find no place in any system of Government, unless by virtue of *positive sanction*. It can spring from no doubtful phrase. It must be declared by unambiguous words, incapable of a double sense.

At the adoption of the Constitution, this rule, promulgated in the Court of King's Bench by the voice of the most finished magistrate in English history, was as well known in our country as any principle of the Common Law; especially was it known to the eminent lawyers in the Convention; nor is it too much to say that the Constitution was framed with this rule on Slavery as a guide. And the Supreme Court of the United States, at a later day, by the lips of Chief-Justice Marshall, promulgated this same rule, in words stronger even than those of Lord Mansfield, saying: "Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the laws is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness*, to induce a court of justice to suppose a design to effect such objects." [1] It is well known, however, that these two declarations are

[1] United States v. Fisher et als., 2 Cranch, 390.

little more than new forms for the ancient rule of the Common Law, as expressed by Fortescue: *Impius et crudelis judicandus est qui Libertati non favet:* "He is to be adjudged impious and cruel who does not favor Liberty,"[1] — and as expressed by Blackstone, "The law is always ready to catch at anything in favor of Liberty."[2]

But, as no prescription runs against the King, so no prescription is allowed to run against Slavery, while all the early victories of Freedom are set aside by the Slave-Masters of to-day. The prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory, and all the precedents, legislative and judicial, for the exercise of this power, admitted from the beginning until now, are overturned. At last, bolder grown, Slave-Masters do not hesitate to assail that principle of jurisprudence which makes Slavery the creature of "positive law" alone, to be upheld only by words of "irresistible clearness." The case of Somerset, in which this great rule was declared, is impeached on this floor, as the Declaration of Independence is also impeached. And here the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN] takes the lead, with the assertion, that in the history of English law there are earlier cases, where a contrary principle was declared. Permit me to say that no such cases, even if hunted up in authentic reports, can impair the influence of this well-considered authority. The Senator knows well that an old and barbarous case is a poor answer to a principle brought into activity by the demands of advancing Civilization, and which, once recognized, can never be denied. Pardon me, if I remind him that Jurispru-

[1] De Laudibus Legum Angliæ, Cap. XLII.
[2] Commentaries, Vol. II p. 94.

dence is not a dark-lantern, shining in a narrow circle, and never changing, but a gladsome light, which, slowly emerging from original darkness, grows and spreads with human improvement, until at last it becomes as broad and general as the Light of Day. When the Senator, in this age, leaguing all his forces, undertakes to drag down that immortal principle which made Slavery impossible in England, as, thank God! it makes Slavery impossible under the Constitution, he vainly tugs to drag down a luminary from the sky.

The enormity of the pretension that Slavery is sanctioned by the Constitution becomes still more flagrant, when we read the Constitution in the light of great national acts and of contemporaneous authorities. First comes the Declaration of Independence, the illuminated initial letter of our history, which in familiar words announces "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, *Liberty*, and the Pursuit of Happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Nor does this Declaration, binding the consciences of all who enjoy the privileges it secured, stand alone. There is another national act, less known, but in itself a key to the first, when, at the successful close of the Revolution, the Continental Congress, in a solemn Address to the States, grandly announced: "Let it be remembered that it has ever been the pride and boast of America, *that the rights for which she contended were the Rights of Human Nature.* By the blessing of the Author of *these rights* on the means exerted for their defence, they have prevailed against all opposition, and form THE

BASIS of thirteen independent States."[1] Now, whatever may be the privileges of States in their individual capacities, within their several local jurisdictions, no power can be attributed to the nation, in the absence of positive, unequivocal grant, inconsistent with these two national declarations. Here is the national heart, the national soul, the national will, the national voice, which must inspire our interpretation of the Constitution, and enter into and diffuse itself through all the national legislation. Such are commanding authorities which make "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," and, in more general words, "the Rights of Human Nature," as the basis of our national institutions, without distinction of race, or absurd recognition of the curse of Ham.

In strict harmony with these are the many utterances in the Convention which framed the Constitution: of Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, who announced that "*he never would concur in upholding Domestic Slavery;* it was a nefarious institution";[2] of Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, who said that "we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to slaves, *but ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it*";[3] of Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, and Mr. Gorham, of Massachusetts, who all concurred with Mr. Gerry;[4] and especially of Mr. Madison, of Virginia, who, in a phrase which cannot be quoted too often, "THOUGHT IT WRONG TO ADMIT IN THE CONSTITUTION THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE PROP-

[1] Address to the States, April 26, 1783: Journal of Congress, Vol. VIII. p. 201.

[2] Madison's Debates in the Federal Convention, August 8, 1787.

[3] Ibid., August 22.

[4] Ibid., August 21, 22, 25.

ERTY IN MEN."[1] And, lastly, as if to complete the elaborate work of Freedom, and to embody all these utterances, the word "servitude," which had been allowed in the clause on the apportionment of Representatives, was struck out, and the word "service" substituted. This final and total exclusion from the Constitution of the idea of property in man was on the motion of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia; and the reason assigned for the substitution, according to Mr. Madison, in his authentic report of the debate, was, that "the former was thought to express the condition of slaves, and the latter *the obligations of free persons.*"[2] Thus, at every point, by great national declarations, by frank utterances in the Convention, and by positive act in adjusting the text of the Constitution, was the idea of property in man unequivocally rejected.

This pretension, which may be dismissed as utterly baseless, becomes absurd, when it is considered to what result it necessarily conducts. If the Barbarism of Slavery, in all its fivefold wrong, is really embodied in the Constitution, so as to be beyond reach of prohibition, either Congressional or local, in the Territories, then, for the same reason, it must be beyond reach of prohibition, even by local authority, in the States themselves, and, just so long as the Constitution continues unchanged, Territories and States alike must be exposed to all its blasting influences. Do we not witness this result in open attempts now made by Slave-Masters to travel with their slaves in the Free States? Calling the slave-roll in the shadow of Bunker Hill, according to well-known menace, will be the triumph of this

[1] Madison's Debates in the Federal Convention, August 25, 1787.
[2] Ibid., September 13.

consummation. And yet this pretension, which in natural consequences overturns State Rights, is announced by Senators who profess to be special guardians of State Rights.

Nor does this pretension derive any support from the much debated clause in the Constitution for the rendition of fugitives from "service or labor," on which so much stress is constantly put. I do not occupy your time now on this head for two reasons: first, because, having on a former occasion exhibited with great fulness the character of that clause, I am unwilling now thus incidentally to open the question upon it; and, secondly, because, whatever may be its character, — admitting that it confers power upon Congress, — and admitting, also, what is often denied, that, in defiance of commanding rules of interpretation, the equivocal words there employed have that "irresistible clearness" which is necessary in taking away Human Rights, — yet nothing can be clearer than that the fugitives, whosoever they be, are regarded under the Constitution as *persons*, and not as *property*.

I disdain to dwell on that other argument, brought forward by Senators, who, denying the Equality of Men, speciously assert the Equality of the States, and from this principle, true in many respects, jump to the conclusion, that Slave-Masters are entitled, in the name of Equality, to take slaves into the National Territories, under solemn safeguard of the Constitution. This argument comes back to the first pretension, that slaves are recognized as "property" in the Constitution. To that pretension, already amply exposed, we are always brought, nor can any sounding allegation of State Equality avoid it. And yet this very argument be-

trays the inconsistency of its authors. If persons held to service in the Slave States are "property" under the Constitution, then under the provision known as "the three-fifths rule," which founds representation in the other House on such persons, there is a *property representation* from the Slave States, with voice and vote, while there is no such *property representation* from the Free States. With glaring inequality, the representation of Slave States is founded, first, on "persons," and, secondly, on a large part of their pretended property, while the representation of the Free States is founded simply on "persons," leaving all their boundless millions of property unrepresented. Thus, whichever way we approach it, the absurdity of this pretension becomes manifest. Assuming the pretension of property in man under the Constitution, you upset the whole theory of State Equality, for you disclose a gigantic inequality between the Slave States and the Free States; and assuming the Equality of States, in the House of Representatives as elsewhere, you upset the whole pretension of property in man under the Constitution.

Nor will I deign to dwell on one other argument, which, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, undertakes to secure for the people in the Territories the wicked power — sometimes, by confusion of terms, called "right" — to enslave their fellow-men: as if this pretension was not crushed at once by the Declaration of Independence, when it announced that all governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and as if anywhere within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, which contains no sentence, phrase, or word sanctioning this outrage, and which carefully excludes the idea of property in man, while it surrounds all persons with

the highest safeguards of a citizen, such pretension could exist. Whatever it may be elsewhere, Popular Sovereignty within the sphere of the Constitution has its limitations. Claiming for all the largest liberty of a true Civilization, it compresses all within the constraints of Justice; nor does it allow any man to assert a right to do what he pleases, except when he pleases to do right. As well within the Territories attempt to make a king as attempt to make a slave. Beyond all doubt, no majority can be permitted to pass on the question, whether fellow-men shall be bought and sold like cattle. There are rights which cannot be "voted up" or "voted down," according to phrases of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for they are above all votes. The very act of voting upon the question of reducing men to bondage is a heinous wrong, for it assumes that we may do unto others what we would not have them do unto us. But this pretension, — rejected alike by every Slave-Master and by every lover of Freedom, —

> "Where I behold a factious band agree
> To call it Freedom, when themselves are free,"[1] —

proceeding originally from vain effort to avoid the impending question between Freedom and Slavery, — assuming a delusive phrase of Freedom as a cloak for Slavery, — speaking with the voice of Jacob, while its hands are the hands of Esau, — and, by plausible nickname, enabling politicians sometimes to deceive the public, and sometimes even to deceive themselves, — may be dismissed with other kindred pretensions for Slavery; while the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who, if not inventor, has been its boldest defender, will learn that Slave-Masters, for whom he has done so

[1] Goldsmith, The Traveller, 383, 384.

much, cannot afford to be generous, — that their gratitude is founded on what they expect, and not on what they receive, — and that, having its root in desire rather than in fruition, it necessarily withers and dies with the power to serve them. The Senator, revolving these things, may confess the difficulty of his position, and perhaps

> "remember Milo's end,
> Wedged in that timber which he strove to rend." [1]

The pretension that in the Territories Slavery may be "voted up" or "voted down," as the few people there see fit, is a novelty, and its partisans, besides a general oblivion of great principles, most strangely forget the power of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States," limited only by temporary exception in favor of "the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit" until 1808. These express words, solemnly accepted as part of the Constitution, attest the power of Congress to prevent "the migration" of slaves into the Territories. The migration or importation of slaves into any State existing at the adoption of the Constitution was tolerated until 1808; but from that date the power of Congress became plenary to prohibit their "importation" from abroad or "migration" among existing States, while from the beginning this power was plenary to prevent their "migration" into the Territories. And as early as 1804 Congress exercised this power, by providing that no slave should be introduced into the Territory of Orleans, except by a citizen of the United States removing thither for actual settlement, and at

[1] Roscommon, Essay on Translated Verse, 87, 88.

the time *bonâ fide* owner of such slave; and every slave imported or brought into the Territory, contrary to this provision, is declared free.[1] In this unquestioned exercise of a beneficent power, at a time when the authors of the Constitution were still on the stage, and the temporary exception in favor of existing States was in force, we have a precedent of unanswerable authority, establishing the power of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories, even if it be assumed, that, under the Constitution, this five-headed Barbarism can find place anywhere within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Nation.

Here I close this branch of the argument, which I have treated less fully than the first, partly because time and strength fail me, but chiefly because the Barbarism of Slavery, when fully established, supersedes all other inquiry. Enough is done on this head. At the risk of repetition, I gather it together. The assumption, that Slave-Masters, under the Constitution, may take their slaves into Territories and continue to hold them as in States, stands on two pretensions, — first, that man may hold property in man, and, secondly, that this property is recognized in the Constitution. But we have seen that the pretended property in man stands on no reason, while the two special arguments by which it is asserted — first, an alleged inferiority of race, and, secondly, the ancient curse of Ham — are grossly insufficient to uphold such pretension. And we have next seen that this pretension has as little support in the Constitution as in reason;

[1] Acts of 8th Cong. 1st Sess., Ch. 38, sec. 10, March 26, 1804: United States Statutes at Large, Vol. II. p. 266.

that Slavery is of such an offensive character, that it can find support only in "positive" sanction, and words of "irresistible clearness"; that this benign rule, questioned in the Senate, is consistent with the principles of an advanced Civilization; that no such "positive" sanction, in words of "irresistible clearness," can be found in the Constitution, while, in harmony with the Declaration of Independence, and the Address of the Continental Congress, the contemporaneous declarations in the Convention, and especially the act of the Convention substituting "service" for "servitude," on the ground that the latter expressed "the condition of slaves," all attest that the pretension that man can hold property in man was carefully, scrupulously, and completely excluded from the Constitution, so that it has no semblance of support in that sacred text; nor is this pretension, which is unsupported in the Constitution, helped by the two arguments, one in the name of State Equality, and the other in the name of Popular Sovereignty, both of which are properly put aside.

Sir, the true principle, which, reversing all assumptions of Slave-Masters, makes Freedom *national* and Slavery *sectional*, while every just claim of the Slave States is harmonized with the irresistible predominance of Freedom under the Constitution, was declared at Chicago.[1] Not questioning the right of each State, whether South Carolina or Turkey, Virginia or Russia, to order and control its domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, the Convention there assembled has explicitly announced Freedom to

[1] By the Republican Convention, which nominated Abraham Lincoln and adopted a platform of principles.

be "the normal condition of all the territory of the United States," and has explicitly denied "the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States." Such is the triumphant response by the aroused millions of the North to the assumption of Slave-Masters, that the Constitution, of its own force, carries Slavery into the Territories, and also to the device of politicians, that the people of the Territories, in the exercise of a dishonest Popular Sovereignty, may plant Slavery there. This response is complete at all points, whether the Constitution acts upon the Territories before their organization, or only afterward; for, in the absence of a Territorial Government, there can be no "positive" law in words of "irresistible clearness" for Slavery, as there can be no such law, when a Territorial Government is organized, under the Constitution. Thus the normal condition of the Territories is confirmed by the Constitution, which, when extended over them, renders Slavery impossible, while it writes upon the soil and engraves upon the rock everywhere the law of impartial Freedom, without distinction of color or race.

Mr. President, this argument is now closed. Pardon me for the time I have occupied. It is long since I made any such claim upon your attention. Pardon me, also, if I have said anything I ought not to have said. I have spoken frankly and from the heart,— if severely, yet only with the severity of a sorrowful candor, calling things by their right names, and letting historic facts tell their unimpeachable story. I have spoken in patriotic hope of contributing to the wel-

fare of my country, and also in assured conviction that this utterance to-day will find response in generous souls. I believe that I have said nothing which is not sustained by well-founded argument or well-founded testimony, nothing which can be controverted without direct assault upon reason or upon truth.

The two assumptions of Slave-Masters are answered. But this is not enough. Let the answer become a legislative act, by the admission of Kansas as a Free State. Then will the Barbarism of Slavery be repelled, and the pretension of property in man be rebuked. Such an act, closing this long struggle by assurance of peace to the Territory, if not of tranquillity to the whole country, will be more grateful still as herald of that better day, near at hand, when Freedom will find a home everywhere under the National Government, when the National Flag, wherever it floats, on sea or land, within the national jurisdiction, will cover none but freemen, and the Declaration of Independence, now reviled in the name of Slavery, will be reverenced as the American Magna Charta of Human Rights. Nor is this all. Such an act will be the first stage in those triumphs by which the Republic, lifted in character so as to become an example to mankind, will enter at last upon its noble "prerogative of teaching the nations how to live."

Thus, Sir, speaking for Freedom in Kansas, I have spoken for Freedom everywhere, and for Civilization; and as the less is contained in the greater, so are all arts, all sciences, all economies, all refinements, all charities, all delights of life, embodied in this cause. You may reject it, but it will be only for to-day. The sacred animosity of Freedom and Slavery can end only with the triumph of Freedom. The same question will

be carried soon before that high tribunal, supreme over Senate and Court, where the judges are counted by millions, and the judgment rendered will be the solemn charge of an awakened people, instructing a new President, in the name of Freedom, to see that Civilization receives no detriment.

When Mr. Sumner resumed his seat, Mr. Chesnut, of South Carolina, spoke as follows.

"Mr. President, after the extraordinary, though characteristic, speech just uttered in the Senate, it is proper that I assign the reason for the position we are now inclined to assume. After ranging over Europe, crawling through the back doors to whine at the feet of British aristocracy, craving pity, and reaping a rich harvest of contempt, the slanderer of States and men reappears in the Senate. We had hoped to be relieved from the outpourings of such vulgar malice. We had hoped that one who had felt, though ignominiously he failed to meet, the consequences of a former insolence would have become wiser, if not better, by experience. In this I am disappointed, and I regret it. Mr. President, in the heroic ages of the world men were deified for the possession and the exercise of some virtues, — wisdom, truth, justice, magnanimity, courage. In Egypt, also, we know they deified beasts and reptiles; but even that bestial people worshipped their idols on account of some supposed virtue. It has been left for this day, for this country, for the Abolitionists of Massachusetts, *to deify the incarnation of malice, mendacity, and cowardice.* Sir, we do not intend to be guilty of aiding in the apotheosis of pusillanimity and meanness. We do not intend to contribute, by any conduct on our part, to increase the devotees at the shrine of this new idol. We know what is expected and what is desired. *We are not inclined again to send forth the recipient of* PUNISHMENT *howling through the world, yelping fresh cries of slander and malice. These are the reasons*, which I feel it due to myself and others to give to the Senate and the country, why we have quietly listened to what has been said, and why we can take no other notice of the matter."

In these words Mr. Chesnut refers to the assault upon Mr. Sumner, with a bludgeon, on the floor of the Senate, by a Representative from South Carolina, since dead, aided by another Representative from that same State, and also a Representative from Virginia, on account of which Mr. Sumner had been compelled to leave his seat vacant, and seek the restoration of his health by travel. As Mr. Chesnut spoke, he was surrounded by the Slave-Masters of the Senate, who seemed to approve

what he said. There was no call to order by the Chair, which was occupied at the time by Mr. Bigler, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Sumner obtained the floor with difficulty, while a motion was pending for the postponement of the question, and said: —

Mr. President, before this question passes away, I think I ought to make answer to the Senator from South Carolina, — though perhaps there is no occasion for it. [*"No!" from several Senators.*] Only one word. I exposed to-day the *Barbarism of Slavery.* What the Senator has said in reply I may well print as an additional illustration. That is all.

Mr. Hammond, of South Carolina, said: —

"I hope he will do it."

The first pamphlet edition of this speech contained a note which is preserved here.

"The following letter, from a venerable citizen, an ornament of our legislative halls at the beginning of the century, and now the oldest survivor of all who have ever been members of Congress, is too valuable in testimony and counsel to be omitted in this place.

"'BOSTON, June 5, 1860.

"'DEAR SIR, — I have read a few abstracts from your noble speech, but must wait for it in a pamphlet form, that I may read it in such type as eyes in the eighty-ninth year of their age will permit. But I have read enough to approve, and rejoice that you have been permitted thus truly, fully, and faithfully to expose the 'Barbarism' of Slavery on that very floor on which you were so cruelly and brutally stricken down by the spirit of that Barbarism.

"'I only hope that in an Appendix you will preserve the *vera effigies* of that insect that attempted to sting you. Remember that the value of amber is increased by the insect it preserves.

"'Yours, very truly,

"'JOSIAH QUINCY.'"

APPENDIX.

THE speech on the Barbarism of Slavery was followed by outbursts of opinion which exhibit the state of the public mind at the time. There was approval and opposition, and there was also menace of violence. As this was promptly encountered, it could never be known to what extent the plot had proceeded.

Mr. Sumner was at his lodgings, alone, on the fourth day after the speech, when, about six o'clock, P. M., he received a visit from a stranger, who opened conversation by saying that he was one of the class recently slandered, being a Southern man and a slaveholder, and that he had called for an explanation of the speech, and to hold its author responsible. A few words ensued, in which the visitor became still more offensive, when Mr. Sumner ordered him out of the room. After some delay, he left, saying, in violent tone, that he was one of four who had come from Virginia for the express purpose of holding Mr. Sumner responsible, and that he would call upon him again with his friends. Mr. Sumner sent at once to his colleague, Mr. Wilson, who quickly joined him. While they were together, a person came to the door who asked particularly to see Mr. Sumner alone, and when told that he was not alone, declined to enter. About nine o'clock in the evening three other persons came to the door, who asked to see Mr. Sumner alone, and receiving the same answer, they sent word by the domestic who opened the door, that Mr. ——— and two friends had called, but, not finding him alone, they would call again in the morning, for a private interview, and if they could not have it, they would cut his d——d throat before the next night. Such a message, with the attendant circumstances, put the friends of Mr. Sumner on their guard, and it was determined, contrary to his desire, that one or more should sleep in the house that night. Accordingly Hon. Anson Burlingame and Hon. John Sherman, both Representatives, slept in the room opening into his bedroom. In the morning other circumstances increased the suspicion that personal injury was intended.

It was the desire of Mr. Sumner that this incident should be kept out of the newspapers; but it became known, and caused no small ex-

citement at Washington, and through the country. It was the subject of telegrams and of letters. The anxiety in Boston was shown in a letter, under date of June 9, from his friend Hon. Edward L. Pierce, saying: —

"We have just heard of the threat of violence made to you last evening. Dr. Howe and others meditate leaving for Washington forthwith. I wish I could be there; but I feel assured that there are enough to protect you, if you will only let them. Do be careful, very careful. You will not be safe, until you have arrived in the Free States on your way home."

Messrs. Thayer and Eldridge, booksellers, wrote at once from Boston: —

"If you need assistance in defending yourself against the ruffians of the Slave Power, please telegraph us *at once*, or to some of your friends here who will notify us. There is a strong feeling here, and we can raise a small body of men, who will join with your Washington friends, or will alone defend you."

Hon. Gershom B. Weston, a veteran, wrote from Duxbury, Massachusetts: —

"I am ready to shoulder my musket and march to the Capitol, and there sacrifice my life in defence of Free Speech and the Right."

Hon. M. F. Conway, then in Washington, and afterwards Representative in Congress from Kansas, sent in to Mr. Sumner, while in his seat, this warning and tender of service: —

"You are not safe to be alone at any time. I will be glad to be with you all the time, if practicable. I ask the privilege especially of being one of your companions at night. I will accompany you from the Senate Chamber, when you leave this evening."

In reply to an inquiry from home, Hon. James Buffinton, of the House of Representatives, wrote: —

"The Massachusetts delegation in Congress will stand by Mr. Sumner and his late speech. There will be no backing down by us, and I am in hopes our people at home will pursue the same course."

The Mayor of Washington invited Mr. Sumner to make affidavit of the facts, or to lodge a complaint, which the latter declined to do, saying that he and his friends had no inducement from the past to rely upon Washington magistrates. At last the Mayor brought the original offender, being a well-known Washington office-holder of Virginia, to Mr. Sumner's room, when he apologized for his conduct, and denied all knowledge of the visitors later in the evening who left the brutal message.

The friends of Mr. Sumner did not feel entirely relieved. Among these was his private secretary, A. B. Johnson, Esq., afterwards chief clerk of the Lighthouse Board, who, untiring in friendship and fidelity, without consulting him, arranged protection for the night, and a body-guard between his lodgings and the Senate. The latter service was generously assumed by citizens of Kansas, who, under the captaincy of Augustus Wattles, insisted upon testifying in this way their sense of his efforts for them. Apprised of Mr. Sumner's habit of walking to and from the Capitol, they watched his door, and, as he came out, put themselves at covering distance behind, with revolvers in hand, and then, unknown to him, followed to the door of the Senate. In the same way they followed him home. This body-guard, especially in connection with the previous menace, illustrates the era of Slavery.

The personal incident just described was lost in the larger discussion caused by the speech itself, in the press and in correspondence.

THE PRESS.

THE appearance of the Senate at the delivery of the speech was described by the correspondent of the *New York Herald* in his letter of the same date.

"During the delivery of this exasperating bill of charges, specifications, and denunciation of that 'sum of all villanies,' Slavery, a profound and most ominous silence prevailed on the floor of the Senate and in the galleries. We have no recollection in our experience here, running through a period of twenty years, of anything like this ominous silence during the delivery of a speech for Buncombe, on Slavery, by a Northern fanatic or a Southern fire-eater. We say ominous silence, because we can only recognize it as something fearfully ominous, — ominous of mischief, — ominous of the revival in this capital and throughout the country of the Slavery agitation, with a tenfold bitterness compared with any previous stirring up of the fountains of bitter waters."

The correspondent of the *New York Tribune* of the same date wrote: —

"Mr. Sumner's speech attracted a large audience to the Senate galleries, which continued well filled during the four hours of his scourging review of Slavery in all its relations, political, social, moral, and economical. There appeared to be a studied effort at indifference on the Democratic side; for only a dozen Senators were in their seats during the first hour or two. Afterward they gradually appeared, and leading Southern members from

the House contributed to the general interest by their presence and attention.

"As a whole, this speech was regarded as being more offensive by the South than the one which created such a sensation before, and there is reason to believe, that, but for prudential considerations, it might have been attended with similar results. It was found quite difficult to restrain some decided exhibition of resentment in certain quarters. The only expression of indignation which found vent was in Mr. Chesnut's brief and angry reply, from which the general temper of the South may be inferred, as he is regarded among the most discreet and considerate in his tone and bearing."

The correspondent of the *Chicago Press and Tribune*, under date of June 5, wrote: —

"The speech of Charles Sumner yesterday was probably the most masterly and exhaustive argument against human bondage that has ever been made in this or any other country, since man first commenced to oppress his fellow man. He took the floor at ten minutes past twelve, and spoke until a little after four. The tone of the speech was not vindictive, and yet there was a terrible severity running through it that literally awed the Southern side There will, of course, be various opinions as to the *policy* of this awful arraignment of the Slave Power, yet there can be but one opinion as to its extraordinary logical completeness, and, however it may affect public opinion to-day, it is an effort that will live in history long after the ephemeral contest of this age shall have passed away. Indeed, while listening to it, I could not but feel — and the same feeling was, I know, experienced by others — that the eloquent and brave orator was speaking rather to future generations, and to the impartial audience of the whole civilized world, than to the men of to-day, with a view of effecting any result upon elements with which he was immediately surrounded."

The correspondent of the *New York Evening Post* wrote, under date of June 5: —

"Mr. Sumner's speech was a tremendous attack upon Slavery, and was utterly devoid of personalities. He attacked *the institution*, and not individuals, but his language was very severe. There was no let-up in the severity from beginning to end. Facts were quoted, and *they* were allowed to bear against States as well as individuals; but Mr. Sumner made no comment upon that class of facts. While he was exhibiting the barbarous character of Slave-Masters, there was a good deal of restlessness on the slaveholding side of the Senate Hall, as if it required great self-control to keep silence."

The correspondent of the *Boston Traveller* wrote at length on the delivery, and the impression produced. Here is an extract: —

"So far as personal violence was to be apprehended, we think he was as unconcerned as a man could be. Anxiety on that account might have been

felt by his friends, but not by him. He seemed to be all forgetful of himself, and to have his mind dwelling on the cause to which he was devoted, the race for which he was to plead, and on the responsibility under which he stood to his country and to generations to come. . . . .

"There was something sublime in the ardor and boldness and majesty with which he spoke. At times we could not but forget the speech, and think only of the speaker, — the honorable emulation of his youth, the illustrious services of his manhood, the purity of his aims, the sufferings he had endured, and the merciful Providence which had preserved him. Nothing could surpass the effect of the concluding paragraphs, in which he predicted a Republican triumph in November next.

"The four hours during which we listened to him can never pass from our memory. It would be superfluous here even to enumerate the points of the speech, or to suggest its most powerful passages, for it will be universally read. An arraignment of Slavery so exhaustive has never before been made in our history, and it will supersede the necessity of another. Hereafter, when one desires to prove Slavery irrational and unconstitutional, he will go to that speech as to an arsenal. During a part of its delivery, the Southern Senators, as Toombs and Wigfall, were very uneasy, walking about the Senate, and conversing aloud. Keitt and other members of the House from South Carolina were also in the Senate Chamber, and were rather unquiet. Near Mr. Sumner, throughout his speech, sat his colleague, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Burlingame, and Owen Lovejoy; and had any Southern member attempted a repetition of the Brooks assault, he would have found in either of them a foeman worthy of his steel.

"The Republican Senators gave excellent attention to the speech. Some of them, who are understood to hold very moderate and conservative opinions, expressed a strong admiration of the speech. One of them called it 'a mighty effort'; another said it was 'the greatest speech of the age'; another said 'it was an unanswerable refutation of the doctrines which Senators from Slave States had repeatedly advanced and debated in favor of the justice and policy of Slavery, and it was a good work.' . . . .

"Mr. Sumner was called upon last evening by some of the leading citizens of Kansas, some of whom are to hold official positions upon its admission, who thanked him for his speech, and assured him that their cause would rather be advanced than injured by it Their course puts to shame the timidity of some persons who were opposed to its delivery, fearing lest it would defeat the admission of Kansas, — just as if the Proslavery Democracy, in their treatment of that question, are to be governed by any consideration except their own party interests and the demands of Slavery. It is time that the Republican party pursued its own course, without asking the counsel or permission of its adversaries."

An occasional correspondent of the *Chatauque Democrat*, New York, gave a familiar sketch of the scene.

"Mr. Breckinridge remained all the time, and sat with an open book in

his hands, pretending to read; but his eyes wandered from the page, and, with a frown upon his brow, he finally gazed at the speaker till he closed. Jeff Davis pretended to be reading the *Globe*, but it was plain to be seen by the heading of the paper that it was upside down. Wigfall seemed in torment. He listened respectfully awhile, and then glided silently around from one Senator to another, and conferred in whispers. He seemed to be hatching mischief; but the grave shake of the head of the older Senators doubtless kept this uneasy, restless desperado quiet. Hunter sat like a rock, immovable, and listened respectfully to the whole. Not a muscle moved upon his placid face to denote what was going on in his mind. Toombs heard the most of it quietly, and with as much of a don't-care look as his evil passions would permit. Near the close, 'Sheep's-Gray' Mason came in and took his seat, and commenced writing a letter. He evidently intended to show the galleries that Sumner was too small for him to notice. But he soon found a seat in a distant part of the Hall, and an easy position, where he sat gloomily scowling upon the orator till he sat down. When the speech was about half through, Keitt, the accomplice of Brooks in his attempted assassination of Mr. Sumner, came in and took a seat near Senator Hammond. For a while he sat gazing about the galleries, evidently to notice the dramatic effect of his presence upon the audience there. But few seemed to notice him. By degrees he began to pay attention to the speech. . . . . Curry, of Alabama, and Lamar, of Mississippi, members of the other House, though Southerners of the straitest sect, could not conceal their delight at the oratory and classic and scholarly feast before them. They are scholars and orators themselves, and could appreciate an intellectual treat, though the sentiments were ever so obnoxious.

"On the Republican side breathless attention prevailed. Those who immediately surrounded the Senator were Mr. Wilson, Senator Bingham, John Hickman, Preston King, and Solomon Foot. Mr. Seward sat in his usual seat, and scarcely moved during the delivery of the great speech."

As the speech was read, the conflict of opinion began to show itself. Democrats were all against it; Republicans were divided.

The *New York Tribune*, in an editorial notice, said:—

"We have said that Mr. Sumner's was doubtless a strong and forcible speech; and yet we wish he had made it on some other bill than that providing for the admission of Kansas."

A Boston paper, in a letter from Washington, contained the following reply to the *New York Tribune*.

"And speaking of Kansas, I may here say that a number of leading Kansas men have called on Mr. Sumner to assure him that the *Tribune's* idea, that his speech injured the prospect of the admission of their State, never found lodgement in their minds. They thank him for it, and assure him, that, of their own knowledge, the fate of the bill was decided before he took the floor."

The *New York Evening Post*, after observing that the speech was "elaborate, learned, eloquent, and exhaustive of every topic on which it touched," said: —

"Though nominally relating to the bill for the admission of Kansas, his remarks took a wider range, and were a general arraignment of the system of Slavery, as it exists in the Southern States of this Union, in all its moral, political, and social aspects. . . . .

"No one, we presume, can fail to admire the ability and cogency of this address; but whether the peculiar line of argument was called for at this time, or whether it will aid in the passage of the Kansas Admission Bill, may admit of doubt."

The *New York Times* was as little sympathetic as the *Tribune*.

"From beginning to end it was a vehement denunciation of Slavery. The labor of four leisure years seems to have been devoted by Mr. Sumner to collecting every instance of cruelty, violence, passion, coarseness, and vulgarity recorded as having happened within the Slave States, or as having been committed by a slaveholder. . . . . But, aside from its utter irrelevancy to the Kansas Question, what general good can be hoped for from such envenomed attacks upon the Slave States? Do they tend in any way to promote the public welfare? Do they aid in the least the solution of what every sensible man acknowledges to be the most delicate and difficult problem of this age?"

Then, in another number, the *Times* said: —

"Fortunately, it has commanded less attention than was anticipated, and has encountered silence in some quarters, and positive disapproval in others, usually disposed to judge speeches of this class with the utmost forbearance. Even the *Tribune*, while it has published the speech in its editions intended mainly for the country, has not deemed it judicious or wise to give it circulation among its city readers; and some of the most decided Republican papers in the country have protested against the injustice of holding the party responsible for its sentiments."

The *New York Herald* took advantage of the speech to hold up the consequences of "Black Republicanism." On the day after the delivery, it wrote thus: —

"*Important from Washington. — The Great Republican Manifesto. — Opening of the Campaign in Earnest. — Charles Sumner's Inflammatory Harangue in the Senate. — Appeal to the North against the South. — The Fivefold Wrong of Human Slavery. — Its Total Abolition in the United States the Sacred Duty of the Republican Party. — The Helper and Spooner Programmes fully and emphatically indorsed. — Mr. Sumner the Leading Light of the Black Republicans.*

"We give elsewhere, to-day, in full, the speech of Senator Sumner, of

Massachusetts, on the great question that is presented to the whole country for judgment in November next.

"Not only the argument it contains, but the place where it was uttered, and the position and character of the man who uttered it, should be taken into consideration, in measuring its bearing upon, and relation to, what may truthfully be called the greatest question of the present age. . . . .

"In that Senate which has so often resounded with the sublimest utterances of human lips and human hopes, Mr. Sumner stands forth the personification of a great and a free State, and the representative man of a great and powerful political party in fifteen of the sovereign States of this Union. He possesses the philosophical acumen of Mr. Seward, without his cautious reserve as a politician, — the honesty of Lincoln, without the craft of a candidate in nomination, — and literary culture, political zeal, and the gift of eloquence, which place him in the very foremost rank as a leader and an exponent of the Black Republican ideas. All of these circumstances combine to give a more deep solemnity to his words, in this grave moment of their utterance . . . .

"Every man admits that our fraternal relations with the Southern States are productive of unmixed benefit to us and to ours; and yet Lincoln and Seward incite the North to an 'irrepressible conflict' with the South; and now comes another mighty leader among the Black Republicans, and proclaims it to be a 'sacred animosity.'

"This is the burden of Mr. Sumner's eloquence, and we need not enter upon its details. But there is one characteristic of this speech which is in perfect accordance with the policy of the Black Republican party in the present campaign. The bloody and terrible results which must ensue, if that party succeeds in getting possession of the Federal Government, are kept carefully out of view. John Brown's practice is taught, but there is no word of John Brown. The social condition of fifteen populous, rich, and powerful States is to be revolutionized; but not a hint of the possibility of resistance on their part, or of the reactive effect of such resistance upon the aggressive North, is dropped."

On the next day the *Herald* said : —

"*Sumner's Truthful Exposition of the Aims of Black Republicanism. — Its Teachings in the coming Conventions.*

"The perfect platform of the Black Republican party has been laid down by Senator Sumner in his recent speech in the Senate, and it is now before the country for approval or rejection."

In the same spirit, the *Richmond Despatch* recognized the speech as an authentic manifestation of Northern sentiment.

"The fact is, Sumner has spoken but too truly. His is the spirit in which the South is regarded by the party to which he belongs. He is its mouthpiece. His is the tongue to the Abolition lyre, giving it utterance, bringing out its genuine tones. Greeley and Raymond are afraid, just at this mo-

ment, to speak the whole truth. They dare not let the conservative portion of the people at the North know that it is the design of the party with which they are associated to make uncompromising war upon the South, — to destroy its institutions at any cost of blood, to hunt down its people even to the extremity of death, if it be necessary. The South ought to feel obliged to Sumner for betraying the designs of the party. His speech is a god-send."

The *Indianapolis Daily Journal* wrote : —

"We have read as much of Senator Sumner's speech on the Barbarism of Slavery as we have had time to read, and must bear witness that it is one of the ablest, most exasperating, and most useless speeches we ever read. It shows all through the genius, the learning, and the hate of its gifted and abused author. It is manifestly the revenge of the orator on the institution that through Brooks's arm struck him down so brutally. It is intended less to check the growth of Slavery than to gall Slaveholders. It is a scalding, excoriating invective, almost without parallel in the annals of oratory. . . . . As a vengeance for the orator's own wrongs, it is ample and admirable. As an implement to aid the great work of repressing Slavery extension, it is simply worthless, or worse. Slavery is all that he charges. But slaveholders are not as barbarous as their system."

The *Boston Daily Advertiser* begins by saying of the speech, that "its denunciation, although strong, is not hot; its profuse learning and reference to history show elaboration and study; and the whole mass of reasoning, of rhetoric, and of authority is brought together and wielded with such skill and power as the greatest masters of oratory might well envy"; and then the journal proceeds : —

"We confess that in our judgment the argument upon Slavery itself need be neither long nor elaborate. The Golden Rule has exhausted the subject, both upon principle and authority. The testimony of one enlightened slaveholder like Jefferson, who 'trembled for his country, when he remembered that God was just,' tells us as much of the actual workings of the institution as all the hideous narratives which its opponents have culled in such appalling profusion from its current history. The subject is one which is governed by principles which are essentially and peculiarly elementary, and we confess that we see not how any powers of eloquence or reasoning could turn him who is not convinced by the simple statement of these few original principles. . . .

"If the majority of the people are already right upon the main subject, — and we should otherwise despair of the Republic, — we must conclude that our efforts will be much more efficacious, if directed at those constitutional heresies by means of which this giant evil is at present carrying on its attack. It is in this way, chiefly, that, within those limits of duty which the Republican party is ever careful to affirm and observe, we can hope to act efficiently upon this great question."

The tone of the Democratic papers appears in the *Albany Atlas and Argus.*

"No one can rise from a perusal of this speech without a contempt for the author, and a conviction of his unfitness for the place."

Also in the *Boston Post.*

"Charles Sumner's recent speech is a curiosity that has no parallel, at least in our Senatorial record. Pedantry, egotism, fortuitous hypothesis, malice, rhapsody, and verbosity stripe and emblazon it with disgusting conspicuousness."

Other papers were grateful and enthusiastic, generally in proportion to their Antislavery character.

The *Boston Traveller* said: —

"No nobler specimen of American eloquence can be found than this logical, bold, spirited, clear, and learned exposition of the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' In it we have the views of the chivalrous antagonist of Wrong, expressed in the pointed and elegant language of the accomplished scholar, and guided by the intellect of the sagacious and benevolent statesman. We are the more pleased with the plain speaking of Mr. Sumner, because there has apparently been a falling off in the language of some leading Republicans since the beginning of the Presidential contest, as if they were fearful of offending the Oligarchy. Mr. Sumner, who has no idea of sacrificing the Right to the Expedient, has given utterance to vital truths in language full of vital energy, — 'Thoughts that breathe, and words that burn.'"

The *Boston Transcript* said: —

"Many persons, who read this speech without having previously read a number of speeches made on the other side, may be likely to consider it too abstract in its character. But, as many Southern Senators, who assume to be the representative men of their section, have gravely lectured the Senate at great length in defence of the principles and practice of Slavery, have taken the bold ground that it is in accordance with the commands of God and the teachings of experience, have attempted to show that it elevates the white man and blesses the black, have even gone so far as to assert that labor, whether white or black, is happier when owned than when hired, and on the strength of these assumptions have eagerly argued for the extension of such a beneficent institution into territory now free, it is certainly proper that some man from the Northern States should make an attempt to save religion, conscience, reason, common sense, common sensibility, from being pressed into the service of the wickedest and most nonsensical paradoxes that ever entered the brain or came out of the mouth of educated men."

The *Boston Atlas and Bee* said : —

"It is not too much to say that it is the boldest, most thorough, and most uncompromising speech that Mr. Sumner has ever delivered; and it is easy to see that it must prove the most offensive to the slaveholders of any of his speeches. It is a complete hand-book of their offences, and will excite in them great and perhaps irrepressible rage. . . . .

"In vigor of thought and style, this speech will rank among the greatest, if not at the head, of Mr. Sumner's productions. It is straightforward, direct, logical, proceeding directly to its mark and by the shortest line, striking the swiftest and hardest blows, and never for a moment leaving the reader in doubt as to its meaning, while it is enlivened by even more than the orator's usual wealth of classical and historical lore. It is in every respect a remarkable speech, and will arrest the attention of the whole country."

The *Boston Journal* said : —

"We trust that the length of Mr. Sumner's speech will deter none from its perusal. It is what it professes to be, an examination of the institution of Slavery itself, — and we venture to say a more acute, comprehensive, exhaustive, and powerful exposition of the whole subject never was made. Whoever wants to understand what American Slavery is must read this speech; whoever wants to make headway against the ripening public feeling by defending Slavery must first try to answer the arguments of this speech. If he does not, he will be in danger of imitating the folly of Senator Chesnut, and, through an exhibition of passion and scurrility, of becoming a living illustration of its truths. . . . . The nation has certainly been drifting into a too general acquiescence in the doctrine, upheld openly or insidiously by both factions of the Democratic party, that slaves are property, precisely like any other property known to the Common Law. Any utterance like this of Mr. Sumner's, which shall call the American people from this disgraceful and dangerous conclusion, may well be generously criticised in other respects."

The *New Bedford Mercury* had the following, in a letter from Boston.

"The chief event of interest, certainly to Bostonians, lately, is the astonishing speech delivered by Charles Sumner, in his place in the Senate, in which he takes up the Slavery Question precisely where he left it off, when stricken down by the cane of the deceased bully Brooks. Offensive as that speech proved to the Slave-Masters, this one is ten times worse. This speech, for the first time in the history of Congressional speeches, sets forth, without the slightest veil or mincing of the matter, the deformities, obliquities, and immoralities of the Slavery system."

The *Albany Evening Journal* said : —

"On the 22d of May, four years ago, we were startled with the news that

Charles Sumner had been struck down in the Senate Chamber and nearly killed. Yesterday, for the first time since that event, his eloquence again enchained the attention of the Senate. The speech which provoked the assault in 1856 has been more than matched in the one just delivered. The former speech was read by millions, and the last is undoubtedly destined to receive a still wider attention. The glowing eloquence and surpassing erudition of Mr. Sumner give to all his speeches an attraction difficult to resist, even by those who dislike the doctrines he proclaims. His last speech is characterized not only by his usual brilliancy of style, but contains a striking array of facts and statistics which must have cost much patient toil in collecting."

The *Hartford Evening Press* said: —

"It is said in certain quarters that it would have been more politic to have left the speech unspoken. It is even urged by a leading journal that the admission of Kansas is endangered by it. The fact is, that the journal knows — none know better — that the Kansas Bill stands just as good a chance at the hands of Southern Senators to-day as if Charles Sumner had bent low and with bated breath begged the admission of that Territory as a favor, instead of demanding it as a right. . . . . The speech is demanded by the progress of the assumptions of Slavery. It boldly sets itself up as divine in origin, Christian in practice, the best form of civilized society, and challenges our scrutiny and approbation. This, taken in connection with its extraordinary interpretation of the Constitution as a charter of Slavery, and not of Freedom, as we have all along supposed it to be, forces the discussion upon us. Let us thank Heaven that we have men bold enough to take up the gauntlet. Charles Sumner deserves well of the country and well of the age, for his calm and masterly exposition of the true character of that system we are urged to accept and extend, as divine in appointment, and adapted to the wants of our time."

The *New Yorker Abendzeitung*, a German paper at New York, published an elaborate leader, translated by the *Evening Post*, of which this is an extract: —

"The oration made by Mr. Sumner is not a mere speech in the common meaning of the term, but rather a thoroughly digested treatise, carefully prepared, on the basis of a great number of facts and quotations. It unites the most thorough-going philosophical research, regardless of the conflict of its results with the nearest practical aims, to that variegated poetical coloring, which, appealing to the power of imagination, is an indispensab e element of an efficient speech. Even to the best speeches of Senator Seward Sumner's speech stands in proportion as an oil painting of richest coloring and most dramatic grouping of figures to a mere black crayon etching. If Mr. Sumner's speech had been uttered before the meeting of the Chicago Convention, he would undoubtedly have occupied a prominent rank among the candidates of the radical portion of the Republican party."

The *Sunday Transcript*, of Philadelphia, said : —

"The greatest speech of the season is certainly Charles Sumner's magnificent philippic against 'The Great Barbarism.' The learning and research, the array of facts, the apt and eloquent quotations, the striking illustrations, and the vivid imagery of the oration are its least merits. The style and diction are as clear as crystal, as pure as water, and sonorously musical. The entire tone of the speech is dignified and lofty. . . . .

"Indeed, we admire his courage, his unequalled moral *pluck*. In this day of compromise and timidity, of bated breath and base concession, when it is the loathsome fashion to say that the Slavery Question should be discussed only as a matter of profit and loss, it is refreshing to hear a Senator speak in the spirit of Jefferson and the Fathers. Besides, does not the South challenge us to discuss the abstract question? Do not Benjamin, Toombs, Stephens, Curry, Keitt, Lamar, Hunter, Slidell, Brown, Hammond, Chesnut, Mason, Pryor, Clingman, Fitzhugh, and *all* the Southern politicians, discuss the question of Slavery in the abstract? Do they not deliver long arguments to prove that Slavery is right, just, benign, civilizing, and necessary, — that it is the proper condition of the negro and the working-man? And is any free Northern man so poor a poltroon as to say that these men shall not be *replied to*? What! shall all the South be privileged to praise and applaud Human Slavery, and not even Charles Sumner be allowed to *describe it as it really is*?"

The *Daily Democrat*, of Chicago, said : —

"This is the great speech of the day. It paints American Slavery as it is, and as it has never been painted before. No Republican can look upon the picture which Charles Sumner draws of this Barbarism without feeling his heart swell with hatred against it, and without recording a new vow to labor unceasingly for its extinction."

Early in the controversy *Frederick Douglass's Paper* bore testimony as follows.

"At last the right word has been spoken in the Chamber of the American Senate. Long and sadly have we waited for an utterance like this, and were beginning at last to despair of getting anything of the sort from the present generation of Republican statesmen; but Senator Sumner has now exceeded all our hopes, and filled up the full measure of all that we have long desired in the Senatorial discussions of Slavery. He has dared to grapple directly with the Hell-born monster itself. It is not the unreasonableness of the demands of Slavery, not the aggressions nor the mere arrogance of the Slave Power, insufferable and unconstitutional as these have been, that have now so thoroughly aroused the soul and fired the tongue of the learned and eloquent Senator of Massachusetts, but the inherent and brutal barbarism of Slavery itself. . . His manner of assault is, we think, faultless. It was calm, self-poised, earnest, brave, and yet com-

pletely guarded. The network of his argument, though wonderfully elaborate and various, is everywhere, and in all its parts, strong as iron. The whole slaveholding Propaganda of the Senate might dash themselves against it in a compact body, without breaking the smallest fibre of any of its various parts."

The *Liberator*, in an editorial article by William Lloyd Garrison, said : —

"Throughout, its spirit was lofty, dignified, and bold, indicative of high moral intrepidity and a noble purpose. No attempts were made to interrupt him, though the smothered wrath of the Southern members must have been excessive."

The correspondent of an Antislavery paper, with the initials W. P., in an article entitled "Mr. Sumner's Last and Greatest Speech," said : —

"The Massachusetts Senator has led a column into this fortress, which, in the name of God and Humanity, must eventually silence all its guns and level its last stone to the ground. Neither statesman nor philanthropist has ever, in like manner, rent asunder the veil and exposed to the view of an outraged people the Barbarism of Slavery. This Mr. Sumner has done, *and no man can undo it.* 'What is written is written.' Slaveholders may rave, Americans may ignore, Republicans may deplore, but the speech and the name of Charles Sumner will live and be praised when the death-pall of oblivion shall cover the last vestige of these unhappy men."

The *Independent*, of New York, said : —

"The world will one day acknowledge the debt of gratitude it owes to the author of this masterly analysis. For four hours he held a crowded audience in attention, including large numbers of Southern people, members of Congress, and others."

The *Antislavery Standard*, of New York, said : —

"Nothing like it, in elevation of tone and width of scope, had ever before been heard in that Chamber. It was worth, to the author, to the cause, and to the country, all that it cost to produce it. For Mr. Sumner it was a great triumph and a revenge. And yet there was nothing vindictive in its tone or spirit. The 'bitterness' which is ascribed to it was in its truth. No doubt it stirred the malignant passions of the Slave-Masters to the deepest depths; but the fault was theirs, not his. His facts were unquestionable, his logic beyond the reach of cavil, and his rhetoric eminently becoming and self-respectful."

While newspapers were discussing the speech, and Republicans were differing, the Legislature of Massachusetts threw its weight into the scales by the adoption of resolutions, entitled "Resolves relating to

Freedom of Speech," containing the following support of Mr. Sumner.

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of the people of this Commonwealth are due and are hereby tendered to the Honorable Charles Sumner for his recent manly and earnest assertion of the right of free discussion on the floor of the United States Senate, and we repeat the well-considered words of our predecessors in these seats in approval of 'Mr. Sumner's manliness and courage in his fearless declaration of free principles and his defence of human rights and free institutions.'

"*Resolved*, That we approve the thorough, truthful, and comprehensive examination of the institution of Slavery embraced in Mr. Sumner's recent speech; that the stern morality of that speech, its logic, and its power command our entire admiration; and that it expresses with fidelity the sentiments of Massachusetts upon the question therein discussed."

The meaning of these resolutions was not left doubtful by the mover, J. Q. A. Griffin, who, after alluding to "certain Conservative Republican newspapers, such as the *New York Times* and the *Courier and Enquirer*, declaring that Mr. Sumner does not represent the Republican party in any degree," said, "It is necessary that Massachusetts should uphold her Senator."

The conflict of opinion in the American press showed itself abroad. The London *Times* took the lead in opposition. Its New York correspondent, entitled "Our own Correspondent," in a letter dated June 6, said of the speech: "A more studied insult to Southern slaveholding members, who compose nearly one half of the body in which the speech was delivered, a more vituperative attack upon the institution, a more bitter, galling, personal assault, or one more calculated to excite the worst feelings, can hardly be imagined." Then quoting certain passages without explanation or context, and asking the reader to "bear in mind that one half of the gentlemen who listened to him were slaveholders," the New York correspondent adds, "These extracts are sample bricks of the whole structure."

The *Times* itself followed in a leader of June 18, where the tone of its New York correspondent was reproduced; and here is the beginning of those attacks on the Antislavery cause in our country for which this journal became so famous during the war. An extract will show its character.

"We must, in the name of English Abolitionism at least, protest against these foolish and vindictive harangues. Scarcely has the frenzy caused by John Brown's outrage begun to die away than out comes Mr. Sumner with a speech which will set the whole South in a flame. We can well believe

that the prospects of the Republican party have been already damaged by it. Mr. Sumner is one of that class of politicians who should be muzzled by their friends. The man who can in personal irritability so forget the interests of a great cause is its worst enemy. Slavery existed on the American Continent long before the assembly of which Mr. Sumner is a member. On it depends, or is supposed to depend, the prosperity of half the Union; the looms of Lancashire and Normandy, as well as those of Mr. Sumner's own State, are supplied by slave-grown cotton, and hundreds of millions of Northern dollars are invested in slave-worked plantations. Slavery, with its roots thus deep in the soil, is not to be rooted up by any peevish effort of rhetoric; and we may predict that the man who first gains a victory for the cause of Abolition will be of very different temper to the Senator from Massachusetts."

The London *Morning Star*, of June 20, replied at length, and with much feeling. Here is an extract: —

"Who invested the *Times* with the functions of the organ of English Abolitionists? Who authorized the hoary charlatan of Printing-House Square to speak authoritatively in the name of the advocates of negro emancipation, and, as their assumed representative, to bespatter with its venom one of the noblest champions of that holy cause? Assuredly not the men of whom, with the mendacious arrogance which has become to it a second nature, it now pretends to be the appointed spokesman. Let it canvass, if it will, the whole legion of British sympathizers with the groaning slaves in the Southern States of America; it will be puzzled to find one whom its coarse and unprincipled attack upon Mr. Sumner has not inspired with sentiments of mingled indignation and disgust. . . . .

"We are convinced, that, throughout the length and breadth of the United Kingdom, the noble speech of Mr. Sumner will awaken reverence for his valor, admiration for his eloquence, and sympathetic esteem for his genial sympathy for the down-trodden slave; at any rate, we believe that there is but one journal whose inveterate malignity would inspire it to heap censure upon conduct which cannot be rewarded by too abundant homage."

The London *Morning Advertiser* also replied at length. Here is a specimen: —

"We are not satisfied with a contemporary who chooses to describe the noble oration of Senator Sumner as 'a vituperative attack,' as 'a bitter, galling, personal assault.' It is full of noble and manly thoughts, expressed in terms of becoming strength, but not too strongly, considering the magnitude of the evil against which it is directed, and the determination of the party by whom it is maintained."

The London *Daily News*, of June 22, followed.

"The barbaric character of Slavery, and of its supporters, has been abundantly exhibited through the press of some Northern States, but it has

never before been displayed in the Senate; and all criticism of it is excluded from the Southern press, and from most of the Northern. In the progress of the revolutionary conflict, the moment has arrived for the truth to be told in the Senate; and Mr. Sumner, as the representative of the most venerable State of the Union, was the man to utter it. He described the character of Slavery; he proved its operation upon the liberties of communities and the character of individuals; and he declared the resolution of the Free States to get rid of the evil of being implicated in such a barbarism, and to save every new community from being cursed with it against its will."

Then came *Punch*, July 21st, which said: —

"Mr. Sumner's speech was chiefly characterized by its closeness of argument and lucidity of diction; but he occasionally introduced a passage of highly wrought eloquence, or an image of singular vividness; and in England, however the orator's sentiments might have been objected to by a political antagonist, Mr. Sumner would have received the compliments of gentlemen of both sides upon so remarkable an exhibition of sustained power and intellectual skill. . . . .

"Mr. Punch begs leave to offer his respectful congratulations to Mr. Sumner upon his magnificent speech, and even more earnestly upon the ample and perfect testimony that was instantly given by the besotted slave-owners to the truth of his assertion of the Barbarism of Slavery. It is not often that an orator's enemies are in such a desperate hurry to prove his case for him. But here he was scarcely down, when the Slave party rushed together to proclaim themselves the ruffians he had painted them, and in the published copy of the oration Mr. Sumner has given at once the calmest and the deadliest blow to the system he denounces, — for he prints Mr. Chesnut's speech. All the bludgeons in the hands of all the 'chivalry of the South' cannot beat that demonstration of Mr. Sumner's case out of the heads of the public in and out of the States. The speech should be reprinted in England, and circulated in thousands. What is the Antislavery Society about?"

To these London articles may be added passages from Miss Martineau's correspondence with the *Antislavery Standard*, of New York. In a letter under date of July 2, the eminent writer said: —

"I may just say that Senator Chesnut's commentary on Mr. Sumner's speech is very amusing here. He cannot know much of the English aristocracy, if he supposes that strangers can get at them by their back doors. Their back doors are well looked to; but in Mr. Sumner's case there was no question of back door or front. Our aristocracy went out to seek him, — not he them. I need not say that we heartily rejoice in the full truth having been spoken in Congress. The occasion brings back vividly to my memory Mr Calhoun's countenance and voice, when he insisted to me, peremptorily putting down all argument, that that day would never come: there would be silence about Slavery in Congress world without end. This

was in 1835. It must be also needless for me to say that no unprejudiced man or woman here really supposes that any terms can be kept with Slavery and Slaveholders. The crisis of your revolution may be precipitated by such open defiance in the Federal Legislature; but we see that it was the South which brought on the revolution and uttered the defiance, and that the only course for the Senator from Massachusetts is to take care that the revolution is steered straight by compass while there is such a fearful tampering with the helm. To speak gingerly of Barbarism, when his business was to set before his country the choice between Barbarism and Civilization, was, of course, impossible; and there could be no fidelity short of such a thorough exposure and denunciation as he has offered."

Then, under date of July 16, Miss Martineau wrote again: —

"Since I wrote last, we have had the opportunity of reading Mr. Sumner's speech entire. I know no instance in which it was so necessary to have read the whole in order to understand any part; and certainly I can recall no case in which careless and conceited critics have cut a more wretched figure in condemning a production before they understood it. They supposed themselves on safe ground, when they cited passages of denunciation, leaving (as such isolated passages must) an impression that the speaker had outraged the principles and spirit of legislative debate by personal imputation and provocation to passion. Mr. Sumner's own friends here regretted what they saw, simply because personal accusation and insult can never do any good, and must, in a crisis like that of your polity, render a complete rupture inevitable. As soon as we got the whole speech, however, the aspect of the quoted paragraphs was entirely changed. Instead of a piece of stimulating invective, we find the speech to be a chapter of history, and an exposition, calm and rational, of the workings of a social institution which is brought forward for discussion, and so placed on its trial, by Mr. Sumner's opponents. To me it appears a production of altogether incalculable importance, apart from its merits in detail. Till now, if we could have met with such a phenomenon in England as a person who was not convinced of the wickedness and folly of Slavery, we should not have known where to turn for a compact, reliable, serviceable statement of the modern case of slave and free labor."

Another testimony, purporting to be "by a distinguished writer of England," appeared in the American papers at the time.

"Thanks, many thanks, for Sumner's noble speech It has been read with swelling throats and tearful eyes. It is a mighty effort towards wiping out the monstrous blot that disfigures your fair country. I like well the way in which he takes head after head of the foul Hydra, and severs each as completely as ever Hercules did; yet his labor was child's play in comparison."

To this English list may be joined a poem prompted by this speech. The New York *Independent*, where it first appeared in our country,

announced that the initials subscribed to it were those of Mrs. L. W. Fellowes, a daughter of Rowland Hill, originator of the cheap postage system in England.

"TO CHARLES SUMNER.

"As one who wandering lone is sudden stirred
With a wild gush of hidden woodland singing,
Doth picture to himself the beauteous bird
That with sweet concord sets the greenwood ringing,
And gazes eager round, and is full fain
To mark the warbler fair, yet gazes still in vain, —

"So I, being melted to my inmost soul
By this thy noble plaint for Freedom's sake,
Do grieve that ocean-tides between us roll,
And that I ne'er can see thee strive to break
The shackles, e'en more harsh than those that bind
The slave-born limbs, — the shackles of the mind.

"Go on, brave heart! and faint not, though thy way
Be rough and rude, and torn with many a thorn:
All England would thee hail, if some white day
Thou, harassed by thy country's bitter scorn,
Shouldst seek our friendly shore, and rest awhile
Thy wearied soul in this our happy Isle.

"L. W. F

"WOLVERHAMPTON, ENGLAND."

This speech took its place in foreign bibliography. French writers who discussed American Slavery cited it, among whom was that excellent ally of our country, M. Édouard Laboulaye, who wrote always with equal knowledge and friendship. After quoting the famous words by which Wesley describes and blasts Slavery, he gives a definition from this speech.

"The Americans of the North, who calculate even to the beatings of the heart, have summed up this multifold crime in five axioms. It is, say they, man become the property of his fellow-man, marriage abolished, paternity destroyed, intelligence systematically stifled, labor forced and unpaid, — in other terms, tyranny, confiscation, and robbery. Such are the essential vices of Slavery, vices independent of the goodness or the wickedness of the master, vices irremediable, — for to correct them is to acknowledge that the Slave has some rights, it is to make a man of him, it is to commence emancipation. Such, without exaggeration and without declamation, is the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' as the eloquent Senator of Massachusetts has justly called it."

The able Frenchman then adds in a note: —

"Mr. Sumner is the Senator who was struck down in the Senate Chamber by a colleague from the South, for which the assailant received a cane of honor, awarded by his admirers at the South. The welcome which Mr. Sumner in turn received in England and France, where he came to reëstablish his health, must have proved to him how much on the Old Continent are still esteemed courage and talent put forth in the service of humanity." [1]

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE testimony of correspondents was in harmony with the Anti-slavery press. Both in character and number, their letters were of singular authority. They show the sentiments of good men, and the extent to which the country was absorbed by the question of Slavery, although politicians sought to put it out of sight. And since this discussion culminated in war, they throw light on the origin of that terrible conflict, and therefore belong to history. Brief extracts are given from a portion of the letters within reach.

There can be no better name for the beginning than John G. Whittier, the poet, who wrote from his home at Amesbury, Massachusetts: —

"I have just finished reading *the* speech. It is all that I could wish for. It takes the dreadful question out of the region of party and expediency, and holds it up in the clear sun-blaze of truth and reason, in all its deformity, and with the blackness of the pit clinging about it. In the light of that speech the civilized world will now see American Slavery as it is. There is something really awful in its Rhadamanthine severity of justice; but it was needed.

"It especially rejoices thy personal friends to see in the speech such confirmation of thy complete restoration to health and strength of body and mind. It was the task of a giant."

Frederick Douglass, once a slave, wrote from Rochester, New York: —

"I wish I could tell you how deeply grateful I am to you, and to God, for the speech you have now been able to make in the United States Senate. You spoke to the Senate and the nation, but you have a nobler and a mightier audience. The civilized world will hear you, and rejoice at the tremendous exposure of the meanness, brutality, blood-guiltiness, hell-black iniquity, and barbarism of American Slavery. As one who has felt the horrors of this stupendous violation of all human rights, I venture thus far to trespass upon your time and attention. My heart is full, Sir, and I could pour out my feelings at length, but I know how precious is your time. I shall print every word of your speech."

[1] La Guerre Civile aux États-Unis: Études Morales et Politiques, p. 259.

Hon. S. P. Chase, afterwards Chief Justice of the United States, wrote from Columbus, Ohio: —

"Your great speech came to me, under your frank, this morning. I had read it all — in the *Bulletin* of Philadelphia, in the *Times* of New York, and in the *Globe* — before I received the pamphlet copy. It is gratifying to know that the *New York Herald* also prints it, and that, through various channels of publication, it will reach every corner of the land, '*cogens omnes ante thronum.*' '*C'est presqu'un discours antique,*' said a French gentleman to me last Saturday. I say, '*C'est bien plus.*'"

Hon. Francis Gillette, an Abolitionist, and formerly Senator of the United States from Connecticut, wrote from Hartford: —

"I cannot tell you how pleased I am with your late speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' It makes a lustrum in the Senate, and an era in the history of the Antislavery cause. But I am afraid the bloodthirsty barbarians are intent on assassinating you. Look out for them, and when they apologize to you with the pretension of drunkenness, understand them to mean they are drunk with rage. Do not believe them."

Hon. Carl Schurz, the German orator, afterwards Senator of the United States from Missouri, wrote from Milwaukee, Wisconsin: —

"Allow me to congratulate you on the success of your great speech. It did me good to hear again the true ring of the moral Antislavery sentiment. If we want to demolish the Slave Power, we must educate the hearts of the people no less than their heads."

Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, so long a champion of Freedom in Congress, wrote from his home at Jefferson, Ohio: —

"Permit me to congratulate you. My heart swells with gratitude to God that you are again permitted to stand in the Senate and maintain the honor of a nation and of mankind. I dared not say to you how much I feared the effect of that excitement which I knew must attend you while speaking in the Senate. But now you have passed the most trying point, I hope no evil effects will result to your health; but, however health or life may be affected, you have again spoken."

Then again the veteran champion wrote: —

"Of all the subjects before you, no one was so well adapted to the occasion as the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' And no man was so well adapted to the subject as yourself. I was profoundly grateful that you succeeded in pronouncing the speech, — and still more so, when I read it. It is worthy of yourself. Thus far my desires and prayers in regard to you have been fully met. May your services to your country and mankind continue so long as life continues!"

Hon. George W. Julian, another champion in Congress, wrote from his home at Centreville, Indiana : —

"I am exceedingly rejoiced that you have made your great speech, and said just what I understand you have said about the whole question of Slavery. But I grow sick, indignant, and nervous, on reading the cowardly notices of the speech by windy Republican journals."

Hon. John Jay, afterwards Minister to Austria, wrote from New York : —

"I wrote you hastily my congratulations and thanks on your last powerful effort, the effect of which I think will be stupendous and permanent, giving a vigor to the cause, and a definiteness to the opinion of the North, and an example of pluck more powerful in its persuasive influence than a thousand essays."

Hon. Gerrit Smith, always champion of the slave, wrote from his home at Peterborough, New York : —

"I have this day read your speech as it appeared in the *New York Times* of the 5th. God be praised for the proof it affords that you are yourself again, — ay, more than yourself! I say more, — for, though the 'Crime against Kansas' *was* the speech of your life, this *is* the speech of your life. This eclipses that. It is far more instructive, and will be far more useful, and it is not at all inferior to the other in vigor or rhetoric.

"The slaveholders will all read this speech, and will all be profited by its clear, certain, and convincing truths. The candid among them will not dislike you for it; not a few of them will, at least in their hearts, thank and honor you for it. Would that they all might see that there is no wrong, no malice whatever, in your heart! Would that they all might see that you do not hate the slaveholder, but pity him as the victim of a false education! . . . .

"I have read the editorial of the *Times* on your speech. It is more than unjust, it is wicked. Nor has the *Tribune*, so far as I have seen, any praises for you. But this is their way, or rather one of their ways, for promoting the interests of your Republican party."

Mr. Smith added in a subsequent letter : —

"I am scattering through my county the great speech of your life: I mean your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery. It is just to the taste of Republicans here, — for the Republicans here are nearly all Abolitionists."

Rev. John Pierpont, lifelong Abolitionist, and poet, wrote from the home of Gerrit Smith, whose guest he was : —

"I finished the reading of your great speech in the car on my way hither, and, permit me to say, thank you for it with my whole soul, — notwithstand-

ing the qualified commendations of it that may have found their way into some of the Republican papers."

Hon. Samuel E. Sewall, another lifelong Abolitionist, and able lawyer, wrote from Boston : —

"I rejoice that you have had the courage to exhibit in a systematic manner the essential barbarism of the institution. Everywhere I hear your speech spoken of in the highest terms of admiration. Even the most desperate conservatives are compelled to acknowledge your eloquence and ability. Nor do they deny the justice of your attack on the system of Slavery. But they say the time you chose for making this assault was inopportune and ill-judged, that it could only retard the admission of Kansas, that it is likely to have a bad effect on slaveholders, etc., etc., etc. It seems to me, however, that no occasion for denouncing an institution which is the ruin and disgrace of our nation can be inopportune."

William Lloyd Garrison, who gave his name to a school of Abolitionists, and was himself a host in constancy and lofty principle, wrote from Boston : —

"Allow me warmly to congratulate you upon your complete restoration to health, and upon the successful delivery of your great speech in Congress, the potency of which is seen in the writhings and denunciations of the slaveholding oligarchy and their base Northern allies, quite as much as in the commendations and rejoicings of your numerous friends and admirers."

Wendell Phillips, the orator of Freedom, and early friend, wrote : —

"I rejoice with a full heart, not only, not so much perhaps, in your glorious speech, as in what we so longed for and hoped, that you are again on your feet, again in harness, — it is so heart-stirring and cheering to hear your voice once more along the lines, and just now, too, when you and a very few others seem to embody all the real Antislavery there is in politics. Those were 'four' nobly used hours. 'T was a blast of the old well-known bugle, and fell on welcoming ears, and thankful ones."

Edmund Quincy, the accomplished writer and determined Abolitionist, wrote from Dedham : —

"The spirit moveth me to tell you how much I admired your speech of last Monday, the rather that I see that the dishes of skim-milk that you are trying to stir to an honorable action are turning sour to your word. The fact is, the leading Republicans not only don't know enough to go in when it rains, but they quarrel with the man that offers them an umbrella. . . . . I beg you to believe that the editors do not express the real feeling of the Republicans about your speech, as far as I have talked with them. The common people received it gladly; and its great power, eloquence, and ex-

haustive and unanswerable quality everybody acknowledges, even the enemy. You have done a good service to the country, and a great one to your party, if they have the sense to make use of it."

Lewis Tappan, the ancient and leading Abolitionist, wrote from New York : —

"The speech is timely and valuable. Everywhere I have heard it highly commended. Still some Republicans dislike it, at this crisis. But the party needs having their attention directed to the moral aspects of the question. May the good Lord protect and bless you, and enable you to feel a consciousness of his presence and inspiration!"

J. Miller M'Kim, an active Abolitionist, who did much for the cause, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"The speech is in great demand here. Twenty-five cents a copy have been offered for the *Herald* or *Bulletin* containing it. I am disgusted with the notices of it which have appeared in some of the leading Republican prints. Maugre them all, I say, and all right-minded men will say, it was *judicious, well-timed*, and *german to the question before the country*."

Rev. Parker Pillsbury, the Garrisonian Abolitionist, who thought the Republican party too feeble, wrote from Cumington, Massachusetts : —

"Amid the profusion of epistolary plaudits you will doubtless receive for your late powerful protest against Slavery, a voice humble as mine can be to you only of slight account And yet I cannot forbear my congratulations at your so far recovered vigor and health, and the cause of Freedom and Humanity, that it still receives the powerful aid and advocacy of your voice and influence. I only regret that a speech of such power as your last must be laid on the altar of Republicanism, while to the leaders of the party your utterances are distasteful, if not absolutely terrific."

Mrs. Maria Weston Chapman, the courageous Abolitionist, always faithful and intelligent, wrote from Boston : —

"Will you accept my hearty thanks for your speech? Exciting, as it must, a rage of hatred in some, proportionate to the love and gratitude it secures from others, I am sure your life is in danger; but with you the greater the danger, the greater the courage, — and courage is preservative. No need to bid you be of good cheer : one in your place cannot help being so."

Rev. George B. Cheever, whose soul was in the Antislavery cause, wrote from New York : —

"I bless you from the bottom of my heart, and praise God for his goodness in sparing you and returning you to your place in the Senate for that great work. It is a mighty blow, struck just at the right time, with a sever-

ity, pungency, and hearty earnestness that it does one's very soul good to witness. God bless you, and keep you, my dear friend and brother! — for you must allow me to use this language, since you have endeared yourself to every lover of freedom and justice, of truth and righteousness, and to every friend of the slave, more than ever; and your noble course might justify even a personal stranger in addressing you thus. You are very dear to us all."

Rev. William H. Furness, the Unitarian preacher, whose gentle nature was always aroused by Slavery, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"I have just read the telegram of your speech, and I must tell you that I have no words to express my admiration, gratitude, love. It is a grand justification of your non-resignation of your seat. The grace of God is on you, — his special favor, in that you have had the will and the opportunity for so faithful, so noble an utterance. It is a planetary space beyond and above the Republican party."

In another letter he wrote further :

"I have no words to describe the blessed work you have done. Never for one instant mind the 'cold-shoulderism' of the *Tribune*, or the heartlessness around you; but rest assured that you have sent the truth into the inmost being of the Southern men who heard you. They may affect contempt by their silence, or they may rail and foam like Chesnut, but they know that you have spoken the bitter and biting truth without bitterness and without fear, as became a Christian gentleman. I declare to you that I consider that you are paid for the inaction and suffering of the last four years, and so are we. You cannot, no one can, begin to estimate the substantial work that you have done, both in regard to the essential truth, which you have demonstrated, and more to the perfect spirit and manner of the work."

Rev. O. B. Frothingham, the courageous clergyman and reformer, wrote from New York : —

'Expressing my satisfaction and delight with your recent speech in the Senate, I do not know which most to be thankful for, — the complete restoration of your physical and mental power indicated by it, or the unabated courage it manifests, or the undazzled moral vision it displays in every sentence. To read it is like inhaling a draught of air in midsummer from the cliffs of Nahant or the hills of New Hampshire. It gives a conscience to legislation, and sets us all back upon the everlasting truth and rectitude."

Rev. Nathaniel Hall, an excellent clergyman, beloved by all who knew him, wrote from Dorchester, Massachusetts : —

"Nobly you have dared to speak the truth, where to speak the truth, as you well knew, was to imperil life : I do not know in our day a nobler

instance of moral bravery. And the speech itself, so clear, so strong, so impregnable in its arguments, so unanswerable in its facts, so unexceptionable in its tone, so free from personalities (save where for truth's sake and the cause they must have been), so comprehensive, so conclusive, so great, so good, so Christian, so worthy, — yes, of a Christian statesman, — so lifted in tone and character above the utterances of that place, — my soul thanks you for it, — thanks God with added fervor, that he spared your life, and brought you back to your honored seat, and enabled you to such fidelity. It richly pays for these years of waiting. . . . . Whatever a partisan press may say, whatever political opponents and political *friends* may say, whatever of coolness and mistrust may be expressed, where you had a right to expect sympathy and support, be assured that deep in the hearts of multitudes of all parties you are honored, and will be by increasing numbers. I know it from what I know of human nature in myself. I know that my feelings *must* be shared. I know that the secret reverence not only of the true-hearted, but of all who have not sunk below the mark where appreciation of true-heartedness is impossible, must be given to him who has stood forth in the intrepidity of a Christian manliness, to declare, in the face and beneath the power of its violators, strong in power and reckless in deed, the eternal law of rectitude and mercy."

Rev. Convers Francis, the learned professor and stanch Abolitionist, wrote from Harvard University : —

"Thanks, many and most hearty thanks, for that great, very great speech, and for your kindness in sending it to me. What a portraiture of the Barbarism of Slavery! And what a master hand to draw it! Such a picture none but an artist of the highest order could paint. I must tell you, Mr Sumner, that nothing on this great and fearful subject has ever so filled and satisfied my whole soul. 'Too severe,' say some; 'not good policy to irritate the South.' I tell them, Not an iota too strong. I would not have a single sentence or word less pungent or forcible, if I could; because every sentence and every word are loaded deep with truth, such truth as I rejoice that somebody is found in our Congress to give utterance to. . . . You have done great and excellent things before, Mr. Sumner, but this, I must say, seems to me the greatest and most excellent of all. The abundance of facts from the most unquestionable sources, the admirable arrangement, the keen and searching application of the argument, the masterly logic, and the manly eloquence of the speech will make it a document of truth and righteousness for all coming time." [1]

Rev. John T. Sargent, Abolitionist and faithful reformer, wrote from Boston : —

"Every column of the paper, as I took it up, seemed to gleam on me like the golden lamps of the Apocalypse. How irresistible are your arguments!

[1] Further testimony of Professor Francis will be found in Weiss's *Discourse occasioned by the Death of Convers Francis, D D.*, pp 57, 58.

How pungent, and yet how Christian, your rebuke of this sore iniquity of our time! How sharp and clear goes the sword of your spirit through all the sophistry of your opponents! My soul has been in a glow all through the reading, and over the pathos of parts I have cried as if my heart would break."

Rev. Frederick Hinckley, Free-Soiler from the start, wrote from Lowell: —

"I write this hasty note to tell you how much I thank you (and I think the heart of New England thanks you, too) for your recent speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' in its moral tone and outspoken truthfulness so far above all other Republican speeches in Congress or Convention, carrying us back to the remembrance of the old Free-Soil times, when the party had more moral than political power, and, not expecting success, could speak right out."

Rev. Beriah Green, one of the most devoted among Abolitionists, wrote from Whitesborough, New York: —

"Such massive, enduring truth! uttered so clearly, definitely, fully! The argument so perspicuous, compact, conclusive! The illustrations so apt, so fresh, so sparkling! The conclusions so weighty, grand, impressive! Every paragraph pervaded, radiant, with scholarly beauty. When did literature, our own or other, ever more willingly, more generously, come, all vigorous and graceful, to the aid of any of her sons?

"I bless God, and thank you, for the deep-toned, comprehensive humanity which pervades, which consecrates and hallows your paragraphs. I found myself, as I moved on step by step through your trains of thought, quickened and encouraged, inspired and refreshed. The impression which the speech as a whole made upon my innermost spirit it is my privilege to cherish and retain. I shall, I trust, be more fraternal in my regards for all my fellows forever, for your brave, manly utterances. Blessings on your head, heart, and estate!"

Rev. Thomas C. Upham, author, professor, and devoted friend of Peace, wrote from Bowdoin College, in Maine: —

"Your history in Congress has been a providential one. I do most fully believe that the hand of God has been in it from the beginning. I thought that the blow which struck you down in the Senate was destined, through the overrulings of Providence, to break the chains of the slave, and I think so still. Allow me to congratulate you, in connection with multitudes of others, on your return to the country and the Senate, and on the utterance of great and true and kind words which will have an influence on the hearts of thinking men throughout the nation."

Rev. Henry M. Dexter, religious editor, and zealous historian of the Plymouth Pilgrims, wrote: —

"I cannot help feeling, my dear Sir, that you have made the most effective argument which the country has yet listened to on the general subject of the evils of that horrible system under which our nation is reeling like a giant poisoned by an adder. God bless you for your faithfulness, so calm, so dignified, so just, so overwhelming in its logical results, and grant that in 'the good time coming' your voice may often be lifted in that Senate House to more appreciative and coöperative auditors!"

Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, the eminent divine and eloquent preacher, wrote from New York: —

"My first duty as a Christian is to thank God that he has restored you to the Senate with physical and mental vigor equal to the great debate in which you have just borne so noble a part. My first duty as a patriot is to thank you for a speech which meets fully, squarely, ably, eloquently, conclusively, the one issue upon which our national welfare now depends. My first duty as a friend is to express the high satisfaction with which I have read the speech throughout, every line and letter of it, and the peculiar pleasure with which I have observed your self-control and avoidance of personalities under provocation, and your fearless and searching exposure of the barbarism and criminality of Slavery under the very eye of its bullying champions and in the very place where you had suffered its deadly malice. I am ashamed of the timid comments, almost deprecating indeed, of the *Tribune* and *Post* upon the only speech in the Senate which has reached the core of the question. If the Republican party is to seek success by blinking the real issue of the right or wrong of Slavery, I am prepared to witness its defeat without regret."

Rev. Thomas T. Stone, the persuasive preacher, and student of Plato, wrote from Bolton, Massachusetts: —

"It is scarcely necessary that I should tell you how much I thank you for your public deeds. I was one who wished your seat in the Senate empty, till either you filled it, or the inevitable doom removed you from the possibility of doing it. May the words which have ennobled it go forth as thunders, arousing souls now deadened by the barbarisms of our country and our age!

"'Quo bruta tellus et vaga flumina,
Quo Styx et invisi horrida Tænari
Sedes, Atlanteusque finis
Concutitur.'"[1]

Rev. Caleb Stetson, the Liberal clergyman, and early foe of Slavery, wrote from Lexington, Massachusetts: —

"It is the best and completest word that has yet gone forth on the subject. If another as good can be made, it must be by yourself."

[1] Horat. Carm Lib. I xxxiv. 9-12.

Rev. Rufus P. Stebbins, the Unitarian divine, wrote from Woburn, Massachusetts : —

" I have read your last speech in the Senate on ' The Barbarism of Slavery ' with admiration and gratitude. As a citizen, a constituent, I thank you from my heart's core. It was a glorious triumph, such as no Roman consul or general ever won, to stand in your place, after such a long absence, for such a cause, and through four long hours proclaim such holy truth in such distinct language as was never before heard on that floor. It is glory enough for one life."

Rev. William C. Whitcomb, an earnest clergyman and Abolitionist, wrote from Lynnfield Centre, Massachusetts : —

" A thousand thanks to you for your speech in Congress this week. 'T is the most thorough, satisfactory, and powerful speech I have ever read on the subject of Slavery, or any subject. 'T will secure millions of readers, and I trust open the eyes of the nation to the ' Barbarism of Slavery.' Ever think of me, and the people to whom I preach, as among your warmest admirers, lovers, and sympathizers."

Rev. David Root, retired clergyman and Abolitionist, wrote from Cheshire, Connecticut : —

" Though approaching seventy, such is my heartfelt interest in the cause you advocate, that I could cry with joy over the thought that there is at least one member in Congress who is able, and who has the moral courage, to do justice to that great enormity, that atrocious wickedness, that deep and damning crime of Slaveholding. You seem to have embraced in your speech the whole subject, in all its important departments, and with a plainness, directness, pith, force, and pungency worthy of the highest commendation. It should be a permanent and standard document on that subject, and be perpetuated through all coming time, that other generations may look at it and learn to hate Slavery and love Liberty. . . . . Mind not what some timid croakers may say about being ill-timed or calculated to injure our Republican campaign. It is not so. You have given us just the document we needed, going down to the foundation."

Rev. Edgar Buckingham, an early schoolmate of Mr. Sumner, wrote from his parish at Troy, New York : —

" I congratulate you upon the fidelity and the courage which you have manifested; and though I do not rejoice in all severity, I rejoice always in the severity of truth, and I trust that the leaders of the Republican party will unanimously decide, that, not their expediencies, but God's opportunity, is always the test of the time in which truth is to be spoken "

Rev. J. S. Berry wrote from New York : —

" Allow me, though a stranger, to thank you in the name of Humanity for

the noble speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery' just delivered by you in the Senate, so just, so truthful, and *so timely*. I bless God that he has so far restored you, and brought you to 'this hour.' Thousands of hearts thrill with intense hatred of Slavery, as they read your startling disclosures of its workings; and the prayers of these same thousands, nay, millions, ascend to the Father of us all, that you may be long spared to show up the wickedness and inhumanity of the institution. I rejoice that not alone on political grounds do you attack the system."

Rev. Daniel Foster, pastor, Abolitionist, and pioneer in Kansas, wrote from the town of Sumner there: —

"I rise from the perusal of your speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery' with such feelings of affection and reverence for you that I must give my feelings and emotion vent by a word of thanks to you. I was grievously disappointed in ———'s speech. Yours fully satisfies me, it is so thorough, exhaustive, forcible, and withal so lofty and noble and patriotic in its spirit."

T. Dwight Thacher, journalist, and Kansas pioneer, wrote from Lawrence: —

"Allow me, though an entire stranger, to express my thanks for the delivery of your recent great speech in the Senate of the United States. You may rest assured that the true, radical, Free State men of Kansas have no kind of sympathy with those who are so solicitous lest that speech should have injured our prospects for admission. We have learned the Slave Power well enough to know that its schemes of injustice toward us are not the offspring of sudden and transient excitements, but are the deep and well-settled purpose of years. And for one I would rather that we should remain out of the Union forever than that a single utterance in favor of Freedom should be suppressed in the Senate."

H. R. Helper, of North Carolina, afterwards Consul at Buenos Ayres, author of the work entitled "The Impending Crisis," wrote from New York: —

"I am in ecstasies with your speech of yesterday. Every word is put just where it was most needed. One such speech at intervals of even four years is worth incomparably more than a *Globe* of ordinary debate every day."

Theodore Tilton, the eloquent lecturer and journalist, sent this good word from New York: —

"I hasten to offer you my congratulations, not merely as a personal friend, but as a citizen, for your vindication of Liberty. Since the Senate began its sessions, no speech has been made on the floor which has satisfied me except this. I am glad that you have been neither intimidated to

silence nor hallucinated by 'expediency' into speaking only half the truth."

Francis H. Upton, lawyer, and author of the work on "The Law of Nations affecting Commerce during War," wrote from New York : —

"Thank God that you are yet stanch and strong, and in all things fit for the fight that is before us. I have no sympathy with those who prate of the *impolicy* of your present utterance, and also suggest the possibility of its influencing Senators to obstruct or postpone the admission of Kansas. It seems to me that he is but an ill observer of the signs of the times, and has not his finger upon the nation's pulse, who fails to perceive that the day of soft words and bated breath and candy-tongued conciliation is gone, and gone forever. Slavery has seen its last triumph, and henceforth should receive no quarter."

Hon. William Curtis Noyes, the eminent lawyer and exemplary citizen, wrote from New York : —

"I thank you cordially for your speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery'; and I thank you still more for having delivered it in the Senate, where you had a right to speak, and were bound to speak upon that subject first of all upon your restoration to health. Allow me also to congratulate you on that event, so auspicious to yourself and your country."

Hon. John Bigelow, the able journalist, and afterwards Minister to France, wrote from New York : —

"I have not found an opportunity until to-day of reading your speech about the Barbarism of Slavery. It is the best arranged and by far the most complete exposure of the horrid rite of Slavery to be found within the same compass in any language, so far as known."

Hon. Hiram Barney, for many years an Abolitionist, Collector of the Port of New York under President Lincoln, wrote from New York : —

"I was mortified to see in some of our Republican papers unkind criticisms on the expediency of such a speech at this time. In my judgment it is the best speech you have ever made. It was made at the best moment practicable to make it, and it would have been a wrong to the country and the cause to have withheld it. Moreover, it was made by the right man in the right place. It is the most valuable Antislavery document that I have ever seen."

Thomas Hicks, the artist, wrote from New York : —

"I have just read your speech. It is solid with fact, eloquence, and courage, — right in matter, place, and time."

Alfred Willard, a strong Republican, wrote from New York : —

"The South Carolina Senator spoke truly, in saying your speech was 'characteristic.' It was so indeed, not only of yourself, but glorious old Massachusetts, whose happy fortune it is that her Senators dare speak boldly for Truth and Freedom. Sir, you spoke yesterday not for yourself alone ; thousands, ay, millions, of American citizens will sympathize to their hearts' core with every word so fearlessly spoken. As your speech was 'characteristic,' so also was the brief South Carolina response. . . . . Your speech will serve admirably, not only as a powerful and able argument for Freedom, but as a campaign document in the coming contest."

Professor Charles D. Cleveland, the accomplished teacher and early Abolitionist, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"Many, many heartfelt thanks to you, my dear friend, for your noble speech. It takes the only true ground, — the essential barbarism and sinfulness of Slavery. The few lines in reply to the infamous remarks of Chesnut were admirable, just the thing, and I hope his remarks and yours will go with the speech in its pamphlet form. What would I have given to hear it!"

E. M. Davis, merchant and constant Abolitionist, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"So many people will thank you for your timely, noble, and courageous speech that my thanks will hardly reach your ear; yet I must thank you for my own sake. Our family here spent the last three evenings in reading it out aloud, my son Henry being the reader, and you ought to know how sure we are now that you *are* well, and how thankful we are for it, and how much good this greatest of all your efforts will do."

Daniel L. Eaton, journalist, wrote from Pittsburg, Pennsylvania : —

"You must permit me, a perfect stranger, to express my cordial thanks to you for the noble, scathing speech on the 'sum of villanies' with which you enriched our literature on Monday last in the Senate. This contest is no holiday battle, but the irrepressible conflict between Right and Wrong. I thank my God that he has spared your life to tell the world that the bludgeon of Barbarism did not silence your tongue nor subdue your spirit. 'Let the Heathen rage.' Behind you stand a million of your fellow-citizens in whose hearts your speech finds an echo. After reading it through with scrupulous care, I could not resist the impulse to tell you what I have."

Thomas MacConnell, lawyer, wrote from Pittsburg : —

"I hold Slavery to be a curse and a disgrace to our country and to mankind; and I rejoice to know that we have one man who is not afraid to denounce it as such, in plain Anglo-Saxon, on the floor of the Senate, and in the face of the Slaveholders."

C. B. M. Smith, another lawyer, wrote from Pittsburg : —

"Will you permit a private in the Republican ranks to thank you for your great speech on the Barbarism of Slavery? I do not believe that it was ill-timed, or too severe. It was just what the occasion and the times called for."

Rev. N. Warren Everett wrote from Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania : —

"I have just been reading your masterly and unanswerable speech of the fourth instant with thrills of delight. Massachusetts can afford to let one of her Senatorial chairs remain vacant, if we can have such a speech as that once in four years. I feel like thanking God from the bottom of my heart that you have been restored to health, and have the nerve, or, as you once expressed yourself, the 'backbone,' to stand as one of God's noblemen and give utterance to truth."

Edward Corner wrote from Columbus, Ohio : —

"It is worth its bulk in gold. I honor the heart and give large credit to the head that combined to send forth such a document. If it could but reach the eyes and ears of the South generally, it would tell upon even that dark and ignorant people ; but it cannot ; a few may see it. There is not brass enough, nor yet iron, nor steel, in the Southern Senators to ward off such a blow. They will never forget it. There are some weak-kneed Republicans who wish the speech had been less severe. I believe in the entire speech. As you undertook to give the truth, why not tell the whole truth? It is time they were exposed ; it is time to hold up Slavery's mirror, not only to the South, but before the world."

Alanson St. Clair wrote from Muskegon, Michigan : —

"And if my memory is not greatly at fault, you are the first Member of Congress who has entered the penetralia of the Pandemonium, and fully exposed the diabolical character of the system, and the true character of its supporters. Such efforts are telling.

"The efforts of many noble patriots have been manly, self-denying, and praiseworthy, and should not be disparaged; and yet I know of no one who has taken the high moral ground on this subject which you have from the first. This, during your whole Senatorial career, has made you the hope of the reliable Antislavery men in America; and your last effort will increase not a little their reliance on and their affection for you. It is a godlike effort, a stunning blow, a blow in the right direction and upon the right spot, which has inflicted a fearful, if not a deadly wound. . . . . I pray God that you may live, and retain your place, to pronounce the funeral oration of Slavery, and to receive the exultant blessings of the millions to be set free."

Nathan C. Meeker wrote from Dongola, Illinois : —

"Notwithstanding what Mr. Greeley said as to its not being proper at this time, I think it timely, and that Mr. Greeley is not aware of the great prevalence of Antislavery sentiment, although he as much as any one has contributed to create it. I thank you for the bold words, and also for the pleasure I have received in reading a correct performance, since there are so many which are hard for me to read. I think your speech will long be referred to, as embracing all that has been and well can be said on this question, and forever cause men to wonder why it was listened to in silence."

Horace White, the able journalist, afterwards editor of the *Chicago Tribune*, wrote from Chicago:—

"I take pleasure in saying that in my opinion your recent effort ranks with Demosthenes on the Crown, and with Burke on Warren Hastings."

John H. Rolfe wrote from Chicago:—

"Nobly and well have you met the expectations of those who, like myself, have waited through four years of silence for your next utterance on the great sin of our times. Highly as I prize the speech, I think your brief and pointed reply to Senator Chesnut fully doubles its value, for all practical purposes."

W. H. Herndon, the able lawyer, associated in business with Abraham Lincoln, wrote from Springfield Illinois:—

"I have received and read your most philosophic, logical, and classical speech, made in the Senate of the United States. The speech is a withering one to Slavery. It is worthy of you, and you of it. I thank you very, *very* much for it. . . . . We feel well out here; are confident of success. We hope the East will do as well as the West."

S. M. Booth, journalist, who, spurning the Fugitive Slave Act, helped fugitive slaves, and was sentenced to imprisonment, wrote from "U. S. Custom-House Prison" at Milwaukee:—

"I bless God for the utterance. It is timely and needed at this juncture. I have no sympathy with that craven policy which would suppress such a speech, lest it might prejudice the rights of Kansas or endanger the election of Lincoln. . . . . Your portrait of Slavery is true; its character and effects are all you describe it; and the nation needs to have its own sin and shame mirrored as you have done it. I see, too, the assassins have since sought your life. . . . . You have struck a mighty blow at the very *existence* of Slavery. You have laid the axe at the root of the tree. We never can reach the evil as long as we fight on the defensive. But if the doctrines of your speech are true, it is no longer a question *where* or *how far* Slavery shall go, but whether it shall be allowed to go or to be *anywhere*. . . . . In God's name let it perish, and the sooner the better."

Hon. A. A. Sargent, delegate from California to the Chicago Convention which nominated Abraham Lincoln as President, and afterwards Representative in Congress from California, wrote from Newburyport, Massachusetts: —

"You go back of mere political distinctions to lay bare the sin and barbarousness of a hoary iniquity, falsely assuming to be a form of Civilization. You have taken up a train of thought, and pursued it well, which I have long wished to have developed, and filled a void in the system of declared truths upon which Republicanism is based, too long neglected. Your speech stirred my heart with feelings of pride for the representative of my native State."

Hon. Neal Dow, eminent in the cause of Temperance, and afterwards a general in the War, wrote from Portland, Maine: —

"You will be glad to know that among all thoughtful men of our side your speech is commended without a qualification. There is no sympathy with the cowardice of the mere politicians, in the fear that it may excite the bad passions of the South, and provoke them to do some dreadful thing. I think the general wish is that *the whole truth* should be boldly spoken, and that the crisis, whatever it may be, may come soon. The indications now are that the South will have an opportunity to make up its mind what it will do about it."

John Neal, the veteran of American literature, wrote from the same city: —

"I have just finished the reading of your great and conclusive speech upon the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' and I have only to say that I go with you heart and soul, and that I concur entirely in the opinion expressed by the venerable Josiah Quincy of your argument.

"Your manliness, your Christian forbearance, your plainness of speech, and your unexaggerating truthfulness are all of a piece, and I desire to thank you in the name of this whole generation for what you have done and suffered and said."

Hon. James S. Pike, also of Maine, for many years a journalist, afterwards Minister of the United States at The Hague, wrote from Cape May: —

"I think you have got hold of a heavy sledge, and hit between the horns at every lick. The style of treatment will do as much towards bringing the beast upon his knees as any other, and the duty is peculiarly appropriate at your hands. I am very sure you are right, and feel prompted to say so."

Hon. John Appleton, the learned jurist, and Chief Justice of Maine, wrote from Bangor: —

"I owe you thanks for your able and unanswerable speech, which came in my absence. More truth was never condensed in one speech. But woe to those by whom it so becomes the truth!"

Hon. Moses Emery, an eminent citizen, wrote from Saco, Maine: —

"Permit me to say I have read it through twice, and parts of it many times, and that I consider it the most glorious and most needed speech ever made in the United States. I rejoice that you have been spared to make it. But be on your guard. The Demon of Slavery will be revenged, if possible."

Thomas H. Talbot, a lawyer, who argued well against the Fugitive Slave Act, wrote from Portland, Maine: —

"I rejoice at your determination to tell the whole truth, so much needed now, when many acting with you either do not perceive it or are willing to withhold it, for reasons of false, fleeting policy. So far you seem not seriously to have been molested; and yet that you have really achieved freedom of speech in Washington upon that subject, and to the extent of your speech, seems almost too much to hope for at present."

Hon. Woodbury Davis, an earnest Republican, afterwards Justice of the Supreme Court of Maine, wrote from Portland: —

"Your friends here were alarmed on Sunday evening by a rumor that you had been attacked again by Southern ruffians. I felt thankful yesterday morning, when the despatches were published, to learn that it was no worse. I do not believe there is another man in the world for whose personal safety so much real prayer ascends to Heaven. . . . .

"Allow me, as one of the people, though not one of your immediate constituents, to thank you for your great speech. In these times, when there is a tendency to *let down* the great principles of Universal Liberty in order to gain a temporary triumph, it was so refreshing to have them so nobly and faithfully advocated in the great forum of the nation, that I felt truly grateful to you, and to Him who has preserved you for such a service. If Slavery is to be restricted, it is because of its own inherent wrong, *wherever* and upon *whomsoever* it rests. And if wrong, we are bound not only to resist its extension, but by whatever powers we have to seek its extinction."

Professor Benjamin Silliman, distinguished in science and venerable in years, wrote from Yale College: —

"It is a terrible indictment, and supported by such an array of facts, that, having now gone to the jury, there can be no doubt as to the verdict, and a verdict without appeal, except to violence, — against which, as regards yourself personally, I trust you will exercise a ceaseless, although not a timid vigilance."

Cyrus R. Sanborn wrote from Rochester, New Hampshire: —

"After the many anxious inquiries during your long absence in a foreign land, your return to the Senate has been a topic of not much less interest. Upon the question often being asked, 'Shall we again hear from Mr. Sumner on the question of Slavery?' as often it would be answered either in the affirmative or negative. Not too late, just at *the* time, you have answered the whole question in your recent elaborate speech. Happy and delighted are freemen that the bludgeon and threats have not daunted your courage and freedom of speech upon the great question of Slavery."

John A. Andrew, afterwards the great Governor of Massachusetts, wrote from Boston: —

"Among the numerous congratulatory letters which your recent brilliant Senatorial effort is doubtless bringing to you, I doubt not you will derive some pleasure in being remembered at No. 4, Court Street.

"'The Philosopher'[1] and myself, as you know, always read you promptly and carefully. In this recent triumphant success I recognize the 'wonted fires' which have now these dozen years illumined our heavens. And I rejoice at the evidence of confirmed physical vigor which is assured by your encounter of the fatigues and excitement of such an intellectual exercise. May you live a thousand years!"

Hon. Francis W. Bird, one of the ablest and honestest politicians in Massachusetts, for many years an Abolitionist, and of peculiar influence, wrote from East Walpole: —

"You do not need that I should thank you for your speech. I confess I considered the risk to your health and life so great that I hoped you would keep silent. But I thank God you have gone through it, for now we may rest assured your health is established. But how I dreaded the test! I rejoice especially that you have placed yourself where the next step logically is, Slavery has no rights, no recognition (except as an existing fact), and no political existence under the Constitution. Then comes the end. And you are to be the leader in that final fight."

George L. Stearns, so faithful as Abolitionist, who did so much for the organization of colored troops during the War, wrote from Boston: —

"I cannot wait until I have finished your speech to tell you how perfectly it meets my most sanguine expectations. It is the morning star that heralds the coming day when the vile institution shall only live in the history of the Past. Your word will become the battle-cry in the coming conflict, showing that it is indeed irrepressible, and will not be put down, even when the leaders in the fight fall back in terror."

[1] Hon. Theophilus P. Chandler, who occupied an office with Mr. Andrew.

Hon. James M. Stone, afterwards Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and a reformer, wrote from Charlestown : —

"I am delighted with your admirable speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' and I desire to unite with the millions of the freemen of the country in tendering you thanks for this effort to arouse the attention of the people to the terrible evils of Slavery. The power of your facts and logic is unanswerable and irresistible. The speech comes just at the right time, too; for there was great danger of too much forgetfulness of the great fundamental principle of Human Freedom, without which the Republican party would never have obtained its present power and prospects for the future, and without which it will surely and speedily go to destruction."

William I. Bowditch, the well-known conveyancer, and among the strictest of Abolitionists, wrote from Boston : —

"As to the speech, the more I think of it, the heavier I think the blow was which you have given. And I am glad to find you yourself again."

Nathaniel I. Bowditch, author, as well as eminent conveyancer, remarkable also for goodness and moral principle, wrote from Brookline : —

"I had not the least conception of the immense differences effected by Freedom and Slavery. Your statistics were truly astonishing. Some of my visitors, friendly in the main to the Republican cause, have expressed their doubts as to the expediency of your speech, — considering that its effect must be to exasperate the slaveholders; but when I find that Bell, nominated by the Union party, actually eulogized Slavery as the corner-stone of the material prosperity of the country, I think that it is well that the true picture should be held up to their inspection, however repulsive it may be. As in some homely picture of the Dutch school, such as that of *The Dentist pulling out a Tooth*, the subject may be distasteful, but all must acknowledge the skill of the artist, so I think no one can deny the thoroughness of your researches or the ability with which you have presented their results. Even your opponents cannot fail to acknowledge the manly and fearless tone of your remarks."

George Livermore, a Boston merchant, who loved books, and was always true to his convictions, wrote from Boston : —

"I have waited almost a fortnight since the first reading of your speech, and have read it again and again, before saying anything about it. I have heard the various remarks of many persons whom I have met, and have read the contradictory criticisms of politicians, philanthropists, and religionists. But the first thoughts and the first impressions on reading the speech have been strengthened by reflection. I could then find no words of my own so suitable to express my views respecting it as the words of the wise man of Israel, and I said more than once to my nearest friends, 'Here are *apples*

of gold in pictures of silver.' For if ever words were *fitly spoken*, it was when you so bravely, truly, and eloquently lifted up your voice in the Senate, and shamed the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' I thank you for it."

Charles W. Slack, able editor, and ever earnest against Slavery, wrote from Boston: —

"If the tru h must be suppressed, if every honest aspiration must be crushed, if everything manly and heroic is to be tamed down, to win a Presidential contest, better be without the success, I say, than purchase it at such a sacrifice. Again I thank you, over and over again.

"Let me say that I know the newspapers don't represent the current tone of the Republicans in this community, even where bold and brave utterances heretofore have not been popular."

William S. Robinson, for many years Clerk of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and able journalist, who uttered what he thought, wrote from Boston: —

"I suppose that you are not disappointed that timid Republicanism in some quarters objects to the time and occasion of your speech. Of course its real objection is to the speech itself. But I assure you that the Anti-slavery men gladly welcome it. I regard it as your best speech, and as calculated to do immense good."

J. P. Blanchard, clear-headed, and vowed against Slavery and War, wrote from Boston: —

"I need hardly say that I share in the high admiration and satisfaction with which it is received by all intelligent persons here, except those few who have sold their souls for office, or who have not yet awoke from the political sleep of half a century. I esteem it especially, not so much for its great research and ability, which were expected, as because it discusses the true fundamental question of the wrong as well as evil of holding property in man, which, though the real issue between the parties, has hitherto been too much slurred over on both sides."

Seth Webb, Jr., appointed by President Lincoln Consul at Port-au-Prince, Hayti, a Republican of the best quality, and always Anti-slavery, wrote from his home in Scituate, Massachusetts: —

"I have read it with care. It is magnificent, and I am glad on every account that it was made. It was all needed, — needed now and from you. It not only expresses my own opinions fully, but in it you have written on the walls of Eternity the adamantine convictions of Massachusetts.

"That there are some timeserving and tremulous men and presses in our ranks who treat the speech coolly only shows that Republican leaders do not understand Republicanism, and that it is a mighty work to regenerate a nation.

"The strength of the Republican party lies in the fearless utterance of its opinions; its weakness, in the suppression of them. A timid policy will be our ruin; a bold one wins friends and awes enemies."

Hon. Amasa Walker, afterwards Representative in Congress, writer on Currency and Political Economy, and enlisted against Slavery and War, wrote from his home at North Brookfield, Massachusetts: —

"I do think it excellent and well-timed, just what you ought to say, and no more, — but what no other man in the Senate would have dared to say."

Hon. Willard Phillips, for many years Judge of Probate in Boston, and author of the excellent work on the Law of Insurance, wrote from Boston: —

"I was not a little chagrined and mortified by ———'s notice of it, as I expressed to him in a note the moment I had read his leader respecting it. Brutality, no less than vice, is a monster, and whoever paints it fair, or wishes others to, by the false character he gives betrays his own true character. I have great faith in plain-spoken truth; and the railing and gnashing of teeth in anger by the Southern preservers of the Union, and what John Randolph denominated as the white slaves of the North, who second them, is a plain confession of the truth as you have spoken it."

Hon. Albert G. Browne, prominent in the politics of Massachusetts, and ever foe to Slavery, wrote from Boston: —

"No poor words of mine can convey to you my admiration and hearty approbation of your speech. I greatly err in judgment, if it is not by universal consent considered your best effort in this direction. To my mind it is exhaustive of the subject."

Daniel Henshaw, a venerable citizen, once a journalist and always a reformer, wrote from Boston: —

"I have read your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery attentively, having devoted seven hours thereto yesterday, and I cannot refrain from offering you my humble thanks, although words cannot express my feelings on the subject. You know something of my views on Slavery. For thirty years I have considered it the leading and most important subject before the nation."

Charles M. Ellis, the lawyer, and always against Slavery, wrote from Boston: —

"Especially allow me to thank you for the discourse of the Barbarism of Slavery; for it shows you *well* again, and leading on the good fight. It is needed now, when men at the South seek to justify the thing, — needed, I think, more than anything, — and leaves little to be done in that direction."

Warren Sawyer, a merchant and active Republican, wrote from Boston : —

" I have looked over the newspaper reports, and have thanked God your life was spared to prepare such a masterly production, so full of facts, so happily arranged, so glowingly knit together, and that you were able in strength to stand up in the Senate and deliver it.

" To my mind, the speech will do much good; it was needed. The great mass of the people have become, or are becoming, what is now called conservative on the Slavery Question; they forget, amid their business and their many calls, the horrors, the crime, and the Barbarism of Slavery."

C. J. Higginson, a merchant, wrote from Boston : —

" Notwithstanding all that has been said and written on Slavery, I think you have first perceived and expressed this 'unconsciousness' of slaveholders; and the additional fact of this unconsciousness being nearly as general at the North as South explains the necessity of proving at this late day, even to us of the North, the Barbarism of Slavery. We thought their wealth and leisure led them to be generous; nobody has ever so plainly shown their accepted necessity of meanness. We have been unconscious of their influence in lowering our standing. . . . . I only wish to express my satisfaction at finding Massachusetts again represented by a man with a constitution, so valuable in the latitude of Washington, capable of standing the burning heat of the South and the chilliness of the North."

Hon. J. Q. A. Griffin, the lawyer and earnest Republican, too early removed from life, wrote from Charlestown : —

" I must thank you for the great gratification I felt in the perusal of your great speech. Twice I have read the whole of it, and many times more various parts. It is small praise to say, what is here on all lips, that it evinces marvellous scholarship, and embraces a sternly logical statement of the whole question between Freedom and Slavery. Its amazing courage and justice will commend it yet more to the thinking men of this and all other countries."

George Baty Blake, the banker, wrote from Boston : —

" Its unanswerable arguments will stand forever as monuments of manly effort in behalf of an oppressed race, — defending principles, too, which ought to be approved by every Christian man."

A practical Republican, very active in the party, wrote from Boston : —

" I have read your splendid speech, and find that I cannot express in words or with pen my admiration of it. It is one of *your* efforts, the results of which will undoubtedly place our great party one more pace onward, as in every case of the past you have done. In my opinion it was needed at

this time; and as I have been something of a prophet in days past, perhaps my sanction may give you courage."

A considerable number of constituents at Boston, among whom were James Redpath, Richard J. Hinton, and Loring Moody, friends of Kansas, and Abolitionists, forwarded the following address, signed by them : —

"Jointly and severally, as men and as citizens, we say, God bless you, Charles Sumner! Thank God for one man whom no Barbarism frightens, whom no pusillanimous policy deters from uttering the truth! Thank Heaven that in our modern Sodom one just man and fearless was found, who, in the face of despots, has dared to plead the cause of their victims, and to brand their tyranny with the titles it has won!

"Go on, — with God, and the slave, and all good men applauding you. Victory is inevitable, and near at hand.

"With gratitude and love and admiration, your friends, constituents, and fellow-citizens."

Dr. Joseph Sargent, the eminent surgeon and strong Republican, wrote from Worcester, Massachusetts : —

"When I first read your speech, as I did immediately after its delivery, my blood boiled anew, as after the outrage which our country's Barbarism inflicted on you four years ago. God has punished that crime, in the persons of its more immediate perpetrators, in his own way. Your speech is the apt and condign punishment of that portion of the community who supported them. In its learning, its truth, and its eloquence, it is worthy of you; while in its comprehensiveness, its compactness, and its completeness, it has exhausted the whole subject. If you never say a word more, your record will be right, and may God bless you!"

Hon. James H. Morton, holding a judicial situation, wrote from Springfield, Massachusetts : —

"I have long been expecting to hear from you in your regaining health, and my expectation has been fully realized in the noble, scorching, withering expression of the true sentiment of Massachusetts on this subject. Would to God that every man who entertains the sentiments contained in your speech, whether of the North or South, had the moral courage boldly to express them! We should soon see an end of that accursed thing, Slavery."

Hon. D. W. Alvord, lawyer and warm Republican, wrote from Greenfield, Massachusetts : —

"I write to thank you for your recent speech. There is not elsewhere in the English language so powerful an argument on the Barbarism of Slavery. In my opinion it is just such a speech as you were bound to make, — just such a speech as the honor of Massachusetts required from you. It is such

a speech as few men living but you could make. Hurt the Republican party, will it? If it will, then the party does not deserve success."

Humphrey Stevens, Register of Deeds for Franklin County, Massachusetts, wrote from Greenfield: —

"I have just read your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery. God be praised that you did not compromise, and that the prayers of the good have been answered! Some Republicans may condemn, but hosts will rejoice that you regard the cause more than Republicanism."

Rev. William S. Tyler, the learned Greek Professor, wrote from Amherst: —

"I cannot refrain from expressing to you the deep, though in some respects painful, interest with which I have read your late speech in the United States Senate.

"That your life has been spared, your health in such a measure restored, and that you were able to begin 'where you left off,' and finish such a faithful and complete exposition of the monstrous Barbarism — that is the word — of American Slavery, is just matter of congratulation to the country, and of thanksgiving to God. The enemies of Freedom and Humanity will of course gnash their teeth upon you, and timid friends will question the expediency of such a speech; but when the passions and prejudices of the hour have passed away, it will be remembered and honored as one of the truest, greatest, best utterances of our age."

Hon. Henry Hubbard, the agent of Massachusetts to visit New Orleans in behalf of colored seamen imprisoned there, wrote from Pittsfield: —

"I cannot, even at the hazard of offending you, refrain from expressing the sense of honor and gratitude I feel for your sending me your immortal and all-conquering speech on the Kansas Question, showing and proving the unmitigated atrocity and monstrous deformity of Slavery, maintained in many States of this confederacy, and threatening all the rest. Boldly, manfully, faithfully you have 'done the austere work,' not letting, by your laches, 'Freedom fling away any of her weapons.' Oh, no! Freedom stood in all her majesty, and used all her weapons."

Henry D. Thoreau, author and man of genius, wrote from Concord, Massachusetts: —

"Especially I wish to thank you for your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery, which I hope and suspect commences a new era in the history of our Congress, when questions of national importance have come to be considered from a broadly ethical, and not from a narrowly political point of view alone. It is refreshing to hear some naked truth, moral or otherwise, uttered there, which can always take care of itself, when uttered, and of

course belongs to no party. (That was the whole value of Gerrit Smith's presence there, methinks, though he did go to bed early.) Whereas this has only been employed occasionally to perfume the wheel-grease of party or national politics."

Frank B. Sanborn, teacher and earnest man, afterwards an able journalist, wrote from Concord: —

"Wha'ever politicians and editors may say, or even think, you have more endeared yourself to the popular heart by your labors in the last Session than by all that you have previously done. Neither the North nor the South can soon forget the faithful picture held up before us in your speeches."

Miles Pratt, a business man and active Republican, of Watertown, Massachusetts, wrote: —

"I am sure I express the sentiments of nine tenths of the Republicans of this town, when I say that your speech is received with joy by us all. Strange that such papers as the *Tribune* can wish that it had been made at some other time! We don't want victory, if at such sacrifice as the *Tribune* proposes. Let me assure you that such sentiments as you have uttered are what keep very many men in the Republican ranks."

E. P. Hill, of Haverhill, Massachusetts, wrote: —

"Allow me to congratulate you upon the delivery of one of the most effective speeches upon the great question of the age that have ever been given to the American people. I rejoice most heartily that the facts and sentiments it contains have found a timely utterance, and it is safe to predict for it a decided effect upon the moral sense of the whole world."

P. L. Page wrote from Pittsfield, Massachusetts: —

"I have just read your speech, 'The Barbarism of Slavery,' and, notwithstanding the opinions of some politicians, am glad you have delivered it just as it is. It is terrible, but truthful. I think it will do good. While there is immense sympathy for the Republican party, as a party, there is too little sympathy for the Slave, and too little indignation against that abominable system by which he is held in bondage. The tendency of that speech is to show that it is not this or that measure merely we have to contend with, but the monster Slavery."

Andrew L. Russell, an excellent citizen, of Pilgrim stock, and an early Abolitionist, wrote from Plymouth, Massachusetts: —

"I have just read your speech with great interest, and thank you for it. It is just the thing, manly and conclusive. I hope in all the copies of your speech Mr. Chesnut's beautiful specimen of Southern Chivalry manners will be printed, with your rejoinder.

"We must be bold and determined now, and the victory is sure. The ravings of the Oligarchy show that they are wounded."

Mrs. Lydia Maria Child, of beautiful genius, and equal devotion to the cause, wrote from Wayland, Massachusetts: —

"I presume you were not disappointed that so many Republican editors pronounced your speech injudicious, ill-timed, etc. I was not surprised, though I confess I did expect something better from the *New York Evening Post*. Honest utterance generally frightens or offends the wise and prudent; but it gains the popular heart, and thus renders political parties the greatest service, though it is one they least know how to appreciate. They themselves are also carried onward by such agencies, as certainly as cars follow the engine."

From representative colored men similar testimony proceeded. That of Frederick Douglass has been given already. Robert Morris, the colored lawyer, wrote from Boston: —

"In behalf of the colored young men of Boston, and following the dictates of my own heart, I write to thank you for the speech you have just made in exposition of the Barbarism of Slavery. . . . .

"In battle, when a bombshell is thrown into the camp of the enemy, if it creates consternation and surprise, rest assured it has been thrown successfully, and done good service. So your speech, every word of which is truthful, fearlessly spoken to the guilty parties in the iniquitous system of Slavery, was properly directed, and has done good service, as is fully demonstrated by the renewed attempts on the part of the Southerners to assault you again and silence your voice."

John S. Rock, also a colored lawyer, afterwards, on motion of Mr. Sumner, admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, wrote from Boston: —

"Your immortal speech has sent a thrill of joy to all the lovers of Freedom everywhere, and especially so to the down-trodden. We feel the value of it the more since the Republican party appears determined to treat us in the spirit of the Dred Scott decision."

J. B. Smith, colored, of New Bedford, wrote from Boston: —

"Permit me, as a citizen of your native State, and especially as a colored man, who has faithfully devoted more than twenty years of his brief life to the elevation of his race, most sincerely and heartily to thank you for your very masterly speech in exposition of the monstrous iniquity of American Slavery. I can assure you that the gratitude of the colored people of this country towards you, who so eminently deserve it, is incalculable."

Ebenezer D. Bassett, a colored professor, afterwards Minister at Hayti, wrote from Philadelphia: —

"The speech, which I read in the *Herald*, is, it seems to me, unequalled by anything in the oratory of modern times, and I venture to predict that future ages will place it, as a work of art, side by side with the matchless *De Corona* of Demosthenes. It is certainly beyond all praise."

William Still, colored, and with the natural sentiments of his race, wrote from Philadelphia: —

"In my humble opinion, you have so effectually laid the axe at the root of the tree that thousands and tens of thousands who have been indifferent or Proslavery will henceforth work for the deliverance of the bondman, — will labor to help cut the tree down. Thus I am greatly encouraged, and devoutly hope and pray for a better day for my race soon."

Robert Purvis, an accomplished gentleman, connected by blood with the colored race, wrote from his home at Byberry, near Philadelphia: —

"Permit me, out of the fulness of my heart, to make to you my grateful acknowledgments for the most powerfully effective speech, in my humble opinion, against the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' ever made in this or any other country. Its *timeliness*, as well as its vital power, stirs within me the deepest emotions, which, indeed, are poorly expressed in subscribing myself as being your grateful and admiring friend and obedient servant."

H. O. Wagoner testifies to the sentiments of the colored people of Illinois, in a letter from Chicago: —

"For the great words you have spoken, and the ever-memorable services which you have just rendered in the Senate of the United States to the cause of my enslaved and down-trodden fellow-countrymen, I return you not only my own individual heartfelt thanks, but I venture to speak in the name and in the behalf of the seven or eight thousand colored people of the State of Illinois. . . . . Could the poor slave but know the substance of that speech, the circumstances under which it was given, in the very face of the Slave Power, — I say could the slaves be made to comprehend fully all this, it would thrill their very souls with emotions of joy unspeakable."

This collection, which might be extended, is concluded with a voice from the Land of Slavery. J. R. S. Van Vleet wrote from Richmond: —

"As a citizen of the 'Old Dominion,' and a hater of Slavery, I hereby send to you my unqualified approbation of your manly, bold, eloquent, and truthful exposition of the great crime of our common country; and let this come to you as from the slave-pens of Richmond, in the midst of which

these lines are secretly written, and within which hundreds of human hearts this moment feel the crushing weight of the 'Barbarism' you have so faithfully illustrated. If these poor slaves were permitted to give you thanks, their dark and gloomy prisons for once would be made vocal with praise, and their tears of sorrowing and bitterness be changed to tears of joy.

"If you knew the deep and secret interest which these people take in the great battle now waging, you would be stimulated in your efforts to hasten the day when we white men of Virginia could unite with the colored slave to celebrate our common emancipation. . . . .

"Some of the Northern Republicans affect to think that your speech was ill-timed; but I think it was just in time, and not a moment too soon. The Southern party demand that the area of Slavery shall be extended, — that the system shall be protected by Congressional legislation backed by the whole power of the Government; is it not, therefore, right and proper that the people of the Free States should know what that system is which they are required to perpetuate and protect? You have torn off its mask and exhibited to them its hideous features, and now let them say whether they will crush it beneath their feet, or foster, caress, and protect it."

William Rabé, Secretary of the Republican Central Committee of California, wrote from San Francisco : —

"We have republished your speech. . . . . I have the honor to hail from Mr. Chesnut's State, but am extremely sorry to be obliged to disagree with him, and to be obliged to indorse the reasoning of your speech, notwithstanding, or, in fact, in consequence of, my having been a planter in South Carolina for years. . . . . It may not be for me to eulogize you and your speeches; but that you have created an enthusiasm and opened the door for free talk on the subject of Slavery no one will deny, and the effect has already been electric."

From the press, and from correspondence, it is plain, that, whatever the efforts or desires of politicians, the question of Slavery had reached a crisis. Nothing touched the universal heart so strongly, and the interest extended abroad. For years the South had been growing passionate for this Barbarism, and determined on its extension. It now appeared that in the North there was a passion the other way. The Presidential election turned on Slavery, and nothing else. The precise point in issue was its limitation by preventing its spread into the Territories ; but this issue, even in its moderate form, involved the whole character of Slavery, and the supremacy of the Slave Power in the National Government.

The speeches during the canvass were on this issue. Politicians were swept into the irresistible current. This appeared in the pressure upon

Mr. Sumner to speak. At the close of the session of Congress, only a brief period after his exposure of the Barbarism of Slavery, on the invitation of the Young Men's Republican Union of New York, he delivered an address at Cooper Institute, on "The Origin, Necessity, and Permanence of the Republican Party," where he presented anew the argument against Slavery. This was followed by urgent requests to speak in other places. Hon. Hannibal Hamlin, the Republican candidate for Vice-President, wrote from Maine: "We want you much, very much..... Will you come? Don't say, No." Hon. William P. Fessenden, learning that he was coming, wrote: "The news has rejoiced all our hearts." Hon. Neal Dow urged: "You may say *all* that is in your heart, relying *fully* upon the entire sympathy of the people." And John A. Andrew, who was visiting there, reported: "Your name will draw like a thousand elephants." There were other States where there was similar urgency. A private letter from Thurlow Weed, at Albany, hoping it would be in Mr. Sumner's power to visit New York, was followed by a formal letter from the New York State Republican Central Committee, pressing him to address the electors of this State, and saying: "The Committee are very urgent in this request, and hope you will consent to speak for us as much as possible"; and this was followed by a special appeal from Simeon Draper, Chairman of the State Committee. A similar call, with the same urgency, came from Illinois, — and here the agents were Hon. Elihu B. Washburne, of the Republican Congressional Committee at Washington, and Hon. N. B. Judd, Chairman of the Illinois Republican State Committee. In pressing the invitation, the latter said: "We can promise you such welcome as Western Republicans can give to laborers in the cause of Freedom"; and then again, in another letter: "The people expect you, and know that no personal motive or interest induces you to come, — only a deep conviction of the necessity for the election of Mr. Lincoln, and the triumph of the principles of which he is the representative." Another ardent Republican wrote from Chicago: "A glorious reception is awaiting you."

During the canvass, Mr. Sumner spoke several times in Massachusetts, treating different heads of the Great Question, as will appear in the course of this volume; but after his address at New York, he did not speak out of his own State. The appeals from other States attest that his method was not discarded by the people. As the Rebellion began to show itself, the Barbarism of Slavery was more and more recognized.

A VICTORY OF PRINCIPLE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

LETTER TO A PUBLIC MEETING AT MIDDLEBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS, JUNE 11, 1860.

SENATE CHAMBER, June 11, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — It would give me pleasure to mingle with my fellow-citizens at Middleborough in pledges of earnest support to our candidates recently nominated at Chicago, but duties here will keep me away.

Be assured, however, of the sympathy, which I offer more freely because I find in the Platform declarations full of glorious promise. Our victory will be worth having, only as it is a victory of principle; but such a victory I expect.

Because I believe that our candidates hate the *five-headed* Barbarism of Slavery, and will set their faces against all its irrational and unconstitutional pretensions, I am earnest for their success.

Accept my thanks for the honor of your invitation, and believe me, dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

F. M. VAUGHAN, Esq., Secretary, &c., &c.

REFUSAL TO COLORED PERSONS OF RIGHT OF PETITION.

NOTES OF UNDELIVERED SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON RESOLUTION REFUSING TO RECEIVE PETITION FROM CITIZENS OF MASSACHUSETTS OF AFRICAN DESCENT, JUNE 15, 1860.

JUNE 5, 1860, Mr. Sumner presented a petition of citizens of Massachusetts, of African descent, praying the Senate to suspend the labors of the Select Committee appointed to investigate the facts of the late invasion and seizure of public property at Harper's Ferry, and that all persons now in custody under the proceedings of such Committee be discharged, which was duly referred to the Select Committee.

June 15, Mr. Mason submitted a report from the Committee, accompanied by the following resolution: —

"*Resolved*, That the paper purporting to be a petition from 'citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, of African descent,' presented to the Senate by Charles Sumner, a Senator of Massachusetts, on the 5th of June, instant, and on his motion referred to a Select Committee of the Senate, be returned by the Secretary to the Senator who presented it."

This resolution was never called up for consideration, but it stands on the Journal of the Senate in perpetual testimony of the assumption of the Slave Power and its tyrannical hardihood. Anticipating its discussion, Mr. Sumner prepared the notes of a speech upon it, which are here preserved precisely as sketched at the time.

IT is difficult to treat this proposition, proceeding from a Committee of the Senate, except as you would treat a direct proposition of Atheism. "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God"; but it was only in his heart; the fool in Scripture did not

openly declare it. Had he openly declared it, he would have been in a position hardly more offensive than your Committee.

There is a saying of antiquity, which has the confirming voice of all intervening time, that "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." And now, Sir, while humbled for my country that such a proposition should be introduced into the Senate, I accept it as the omen of that madness which precedes the fall of its authors.

At this moment the number of free persons, African by descent, in the United States, is almost half a million, — being a population two thirds larger than the white population in South Carolina, more than one third larger than the white population in Mississippi, and six times larger than the white population in Florida. I mention these facts in order to show at the outset the number of persons whose rights are now assailed.

Already, in several States, free negroes are threatened with expulsion, under the terrible penalty of being sold into Slavery. The Supreme Court of the United States has stepped forward, and by cruel decree declared that they are not citizens, and therefore are not entitled to sue in the courts of the United States. And now, to complete their degradation and exclusion from all rights, it is proposed to declare that their petitions cannot be received by the Senate.

The right of petition is not *political*, but *personal*, — born with Humanity, and confirmed by Christianity, — belonging to all, but peculiar to the humble, the weak, and the oppressed. It belongs even to the criminal; for it is simply the right to pray.

There is no country, professing civilization, where this right is not sacred. In Mahometan countries it is revered. One of the most touching stories of the East is where a petitioner in affliction came before the Sultan, crying out, —

> "'My sorrow is my right,
> And I *will* see the Sultan, and to-night.'
> 'Sorrow,' said Mahmoud, 'is a reverend thing;
> I recognize its right, as king with king:
> Speak on.'"[1]

To take this right away from any portion of our *fellow-subjects* — even if you say they are not *fellow-citizens* — will be barbarous. And when I consider under what influence this proposition is brought forward, I present it as a fresh illustration of the Barbarism of Slavery, — most barbarous in the unconsciousness of its Barbarism.

The outrage is apparent from a simple statement.

In all the States — even in the Slave States — a free colored man may hold property of all kinds, personal or real, — even land, in which citizenship strikes its strongest root; but you will not allow him the poor right of petition.

He may own stocks of the United States, Treasury notes, and in other ways be the creditor of the Government; but you will not allow him the poor right of petition.

He is strictly bound by every enactment upon our statute-book; and yet you will not allow him to appear before you with a prayer to modify or soften this statute-book.

He is rigidly held to pay his quota of taxes; but you will not allow him to ask for their reduction.

[1] Leigh Hunt, Poems: Mahmoud.

And still further, under all your pension laws for Revolutionary services, and for services in other wars, whether on land or sea, he is entitled to a pension precisely as if he were white; but you will not allow him to solicit aid under these laws.

Such is a simple statement of the injustice you are about to do. On this statement alone, without one word of argument or illustration, you will surely recoil.

But this proposition proceeds on two assumptions, each of which is radically false: *first*, that a free person of African descent is not a citizen of the United States; and, *secondly*, that none other than a citizen is entitled to petition Congress.

In support of the first assumption is the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott. But against that decision — so unfortunate for the character of the tribunal from which it proceeded, — which has degraded that tribunal hardly less than it sought to degrade the African race — I oppose the actual fact in at least *six* of the original thirteen States at the adoption of the Constitution.

First, in Massachusetts, where the present petitioners reside, all persons, without distinction of color, are treated as citizens by its Constitution adopted in 1780.

Secondly, in Virginia, the State represented by the Senator [Mr. MASON] who brings forward this decree of disfranchisement, the same principle prevailed at the same time. And here I call attention to the 11th volume of Hening's Virginia Statutes, where, on page 322, may be found the law of October, 1783, which repeals that of 1779, limiting citizenship to whites, and enacts, "that *all free persons* born within the territory of this Commonwealth . . . . shall be deemed

citizens of this Commonwealth," without one word referring to descent or color.

Thirdly, in New Hampshire, whose Constitution conferred the elective franchise upon "every inhabitant of the State having the proper qualifications," — of which descent or color was not one.

Fourthly, in New York, where the Constitution conferred the elective franchise upon "every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided," &c., "if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder," &c., — without any discrimination of descent or color.

Fifthly, in New Jersey, by whose Constitution the elective franchise was conferred upon "*all inhabitants* of this colony, of full age, who are worth fifty pounds, proclamation money, clear estate," — also without any discrimination of descent or color.

Sixthly, in North Carolina, where Mr. Justice Gaston, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of the State in the case of *The State* v. *Manuel*, declared that "the Constitution extended the elective franchise to *every freeman* who had arrived at the age of twenty-one and paid a public tax; and it is a matter of universal notoriety, that, under it, *free persons*, without regard to color, claimed and exercised the franchise, until it was taken from free men of color a few years since by our amended Constitution."[1]

To these authoritative precedents, drawn from the very epoch of the National Constitution, I might add other illustrations. I content myself with referring to the Constitution of Missouri, which, in speaking of "every free *white* male citizen,"[2] admits by implication

[1] 4 Devereux & Battle, 20.

[2] 1 Revised Statutes of Missouri, Art. III. Sec. 10.

that colored persons may be *citizens*, and to the Code of Alabama, which declares that certain sections "do not apply to or affect any free person of color who by the Treaty between the United States and Spain became *a citizen of the United States, or the descendants of such.*"[1]

But not only in six of the old thirteen States *all freemen* without distinction of color were *citizens*, but also under the Articles of Confederation they were *citizens*. By the fourth article it was expressly declared that "the *free inhabitants* of each of these States (paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted) shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of *free citizens* in the several States." The meaning of this clause, which is clear on its face, becomes clearer still, when it is known, that, while it was under discussion, on the 25th of June, 1778, the delegates from South Carolina moved to amend it by inserting between the words "free inhabitants" the word "white," so that the character of a citizen should be restricted to white persons. This proposition was rejected, — two States only voting for it, eight States against it, and the vote of one State being divided; so that the term "free inhabitants" was left in its full significance, without any distinction of descent or color.

The Constitution of the United States next followed. And it contains not a sentence, phrase, or word of disfranchisement on account of descent or color, any more than on account of religion.

If the present question depended upon citizenship, you could not refuse to receive the petition. But it does not depend upon citizenship. The right to pe-

[1] Code of Alabama, § 1037, p. 241.

tition Congress is not an incident of the elective franchise. It exists where the elective franchise does not exist. The Constitution expressly secures it, not simply to *citizens*, but broadly and completely to THE PEOPLE, declaring, in the first article of its Amendments, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, *or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.*"

The term *people* here naturally means all, without distinction of class, who owe allegiance to the Government. It is the American equivalent for *subjects*. If there were any doubt on this point, it would be removed by the clear and irresistible meaning of the term in other parts of the Constitution. Thus, in the clause constituting the House of Representatives, it is declared that it "shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the *people* of the several States, and the *electors* in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature." Here is an obvious difference between the "people" and "electors." The former is broader than the latter. It is the former that constitutes the *basis of representation*, and the Constitution then proceeds to declare that this basis "shall be determined by adding *to the whole number of free persons*, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other persons." Whatever may be the position of the *fractional* class, nothing can be clearer than that all *free persons*, without distinction of color or descent, be-

long to the *people*, and, so belonging, they are solemnly and expressly protected by the Constitution in the right of petition.

The Constitution next provides for the "enumeration" of the *people*, and under this provision there is a decennial census of the whole *people*, without distinction of color or descent; and yet, while including all of African descent in your population, you refuse to receive their petitions.

The present proposition is aggravated by well-attested facts in our history. A colored man, Crispus Attucks, was the first martyr of our Revolutionary struggle. Throughout the long war of seven years, while national independence was still doubtful, colored men fought sometimes in the same ranks with the whites, and sometimes in separate companies, but always with patriotic courage, and often under the eye of Washington. The blood of the two races mingled, and, dying on the same field, they were buried beneath the same sod. And this same association was continued throughout the War of 1812, in all our naval contests, and especially in the Battle of Lake Erie under Perry, and of Lake Champlain under Macdonough, where colored men performed a conspicuous part. But no better testimony can be presented than the eloquent proclamation of General Jackson, before the Battle of New Orleans, where he calls upon the "free colored inhabitants of Louisiana" to take part in the contest as *American soldiers*, and speaks of them by implication as "fellow-citizens."[1] "American soldiers" and "fellow-citizens": such is the language of Andrew Jackson, when speaking of those whom you would despoil of a venerable right.

[1] Niles's Weekly Register, Vol. VII. p. 205, December 3, 1814.

Thus, Sir, throughout our history, you have used these men for defence of the country, you have coined their blood into your own liberties; but you deny them now the smallest liberty of all, — the last which is left to the miserable, — *the liberty to pray.* In the history of misfortune or of tyranny nothing can surpass this final act of robbery. The words of the classic poet are fulfilled: —

> "'The wretch, in short, had nothing.' You say true:
> And yet the wretch *must lose that nothing too.*" [1]

There is a story of General Washington which illustrates by contrast the wrong of the present proposition. On a certain occasion, being engaged late at the quarters of his aid, Colonel Pickering, of Massachusetts, he proposed to pass the night, if the colored servant, Primus Hall, whom I remember at Boston in my childhood, could find straw and a blanket. Of course they were found; but it was by the surrender of the servant's own blanket. In the course of the night, the General, becoming aware of the sacrifice, most authoritatively required the servant to share the blanket, saying, "There is room for both, and I insist upon it"; and on the same straw, beneath the same blanket, the General and the faithful African slept till morning sun.[2] You not only refuse to share your liberties with the colored man, but you now propose to take from him his last blanket.

This is not the time to dwell on the character of the colored race; for the right of petition can never depend on the character of the petitioner, while in criminal

[1] Juvenal, Sat. III., 208, 209.

[2] Anecdotes of Washington, by Rev. Henry F. Harrington: Godey's Lady's Book, June, 1849.

cases liberty and life even may. But I mention two facts which speak for this much injured people. The first, Sir, is the official census, by which it appears that throughout the Free States among the colored population a much larger proportion attend school than among the whites of the Slave States, and this contrast becomes still more apparent when we consider the small attendance upon school by the whites in South Carolina. The other fact appears in the last will and testament of Mr. Upshur, of Virginia, Secretary of State under President Tyler, where he thus speaks: —

"I emancipate and set free my servant, David Rich, and direct my executors to give him one hundred dollars. I recommend him in the strongest manner to the respect, esteem, and confidence of any community in which he may happen to live. He has been my slave for twenty-four years, during which time he has been trusted to every extent and in every respect. My confidence in him has been unbounded; his relation to myself and family has always been such as to afford him daily opportunities to deceive and injure us, and yet he has never been detected in a serious fault, nor even in an intentional breach of the decorums of his station. His intelligence is of a high order, his integrity above all suspicion, and his sense of right and propriety always correct and even delicate and refined. I feel that he is justly entitled to carry this certificate from me into the new relations which he now must form. It is due to his long and most faithful services, and to the sincere and steady friendship which I bear him. In the uninterrupted and confidential intercourse of twenty-four years, I have never given nor had occasion to give him an unpleasant word. I know no man who has fewer faults or more excellencies than he. A. P. UPSHUR." [1]

[1] Nell, Services of Colored Americans in the Wars of 1776 and 1812, pp. 23, 24.

I do not dwell on precedents; for Senators willing to entertain this proposition can have little regard for any precedents in favor of Human Rights. I content myself with saying, that never before has this assault on Human Rights been made, — that petitions from colored persons have been often presented and refused, precisely as other petitions. Here, for example, is an instance on the Journals of the Senate: —

"Mr. Seward presented a petition of citizens of Ontario County, New York, praying that the army may be disbanded, and its services hereafter dispensed with; *a petition of male and female colored inhabitants of Boston, Massachusetts*, praying that colored men may be employed in transporting the mails, and enrolled in the militia; *and a petition of male and female colored inhabitants of Boston, Massachusetts*, protesting against the enactment of a law for the recovery of fugitive slaves." [1]

But I have said enough. Most earnestly and sincerely do I protest against this attempt, on three grounds: *first*, because, being essentially barbarous in character, it must be utterly shameful to a government boasting Christianity and professing Civilization; *secondly*, because it is a flagrant violation of the constitutional rights of more than half a million of American people; and, *thirdly*, because, in the present case, it is an insult to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, where these petitioners reside in the free enjoyment of all the rights of citizens, — among others, of voting for Members of Congress. I am unwilling to weaken this argument for Human Rights by any appeal to State Rights; but I cannot fail to observe that this proposition, which tramples down State Rights in order to assail Human Rights,

[1] Senate Journal, 31st Cong. 1st Sess., p. 318, April 30, 1850.

proceeds from a Senator [Mr. MASON] who always avows himself the defender of State Rights.

For myself, Sir, my course is plain. Whatever may be the action of the Senate, I shall continue to present such petitions. And permit me to say, that I should be little worthy of the place I now hold, if, at any time hereafter, receiving such petitions, I hesitate in the discharge of this sacred duty.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN SCHWARTZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON THE RESOLUTIONS IN TRIBUTE TO HIM, JUNE 21, 1860.

MR. PRESIDENT, — Some men make themselves felt at once by their simple presence, and Mr. Schwartz was of this number. No person could set eyes on him without being moved to inquire who he was, or, if the occasion presented, to form his acquaintance. His look was that of goodness, and he acted in a way to confirm the charm of his appearance. Entering tardily into public life, he followed the prompting of duty, and not of ambition. At this call he severed friendships, personal and political, believing that principle was of higher worth than party or politician or President. Thus, when already reverend with age, he became a Representative in Congress.

His presence in the other House was a protest. All who saw him there knew that he came from a constituency which had always been represented by an unhesitating member of the Democratic party, while he openly denounced that party,[1] and associated himself cordially and completely with those who, founding themselves on the Declaration of Independence and the

[1] Mr. Schwartz was of Berks County, and had been a Democrat all his life, until he felt constrained on the Lecompton Question to take ground against his old party.

Constitution, sought to bring the National Government to the ancient ways. I mention this circumstance, because it is an essential part of his too brief public life, while it illustrates his character, and proclaims his title to honor. The powerful party leader, "with a Senate at his heels," is less worthy of love and consideration than the simple citizen, who, scorning party ties, dares to be true and just.

But never did man, who had broken down a party at home, and taken his seat as representative of Opposition, wear his signal success more gently. Though decided and firm in conduct, he was winning and sweet in manner, and by beautiful example showed how to unite two qualities which are not always found together. Winter was not sterner, summer was not softer.

In character he did honor to the brave and pure German stock, which, even from that early day when first revealed to history in the sharp and clean-cut style of Tacitus, has preserved its original peculiarities untouched by change, showing, that, though the individual is mortal, the race is immortal. American by birth, and American in a generous patriotism, he was German in his clear blue eye, in his physical frame, in the warmth of his affections, and in the simplicity of his life. To him alone our tribute is now due; but, in pronouncing the name of JOHN SCHWARTZ, we cannot forget the "fatherland" of his ancestors, which out of its abundance has given to our Republic so many good heads, so many strong arms, with so much of virtue and intelligence, rejoicing in freedom, and calling no man master.

UNHESITATING ASSERTION OF OUR PRINCIPLES.

LETTER TO THE REPUBLICANS OF NEW YORK CITY,
JUNE 27, 1860.

AN enthusiastic meeting of the Old Men's and Young Men's Republican Central Committees of the City of New York was held on the evening of June 28, for the purpose of extending a welcome to the Republican Senators of the Eastern States, on their return from Congress. D. D. Conover, of the Old Men's Committee, presided, assisted by Charles S. Spencer, of the Young Men's Committee. The following letter from Mr. Sumner, in answer to an invitation, was read by Edgar Ketchum.

SENATE CHAMBER, June 27, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — I must renounce the opportunity of meeting the Republicans of New York tomorrow evening, asking them to accept my thanks for the invitation with which they have honored me.

Let me congratulate them on the good omens which cheer us on every side.

It only remains, that, by *unhesitating assertion of our principles*, we continue to deserve victory.

Believe me, my dear Sir,
Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

EDGAR KETCHUM, Esq.

SOUTHBRIDGE
PUBLIC LIBRARY.
DISCARDED.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY:

ITS ORIGIN, NECESSITY, AND PERMANENCE.

SPEECH BEFORE THE YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN UNION OF NEW YORK, AT COOPER INSTITUTE, JULY 11, 1860.

THIS early speech in the Presidential campaign which ended in the election of Abraham Lincoln was made by Mr. Sumner while on his way home from Washington. It was reported and noticed by the New York press. A journal having little sympathy with it describes the magnificence and enthusiasm of the auditory, and thus abridges the speech in flaming capitals: "The Presidential Contest; Great Convulsion in the Republican Camp; Charles Sumner on the Stump; A Strong Plea for Old Abe; Another Attack upon Slaveholders; The Fivefold Wrong of Human Slavery."

The meeting is mentioned in all the journals as one of the largest ever assembled within the walls of Cooper Institute, and also remarkable for respectability of appearance. One of them says it seemed more like an audience of some great concert or festival than a political meeting. As soon as the doors were opened every available position was occupied, and in half an hour afterwards it was impossible to find accommodation. More than one third of the vast hall had been reserved for ladies, and it was completely filled. The windows of the upper floor opening upon the basement were crammed with people. On the stage were many distinguished persons, judges and ex-judges. The welcome of the speaker is thus noticed by another: —

"Mr. Sumner appeared on the rostrum precisely at eight o'clock, and was received with an outburst of excited enthusiasm which defies all description. The applause was unanimous and intense. Cheer after cheer arose, loud and vociferous; men stood up and waved their handkerchiefs and their hats till scarcely anything else could be seen."

The scene at this time was chronicled by the *Independent*.

"The orator's return to the people, after his long and enforced retirement from the platform, was celebrated at Cooper Institute with such a welcome

as we have rarely seen given to any man. On coming forward, he was greeted with cheer after cheer, the audience rising and prolonging their salutations through many minutes, with continuous shouting and waving of handkerchiefs."

Mr. Rogers, the President of the Young Men's Republican Union, nominated for chairman of the meeting Hon. Abijah Mann, Jr., which nomination was unanimously accepted. Mr. Mann, on taking the chair, said that they had now to listen to the voice of one who had stood up manfully for freedom of speech, not only against open foes, but even against the opposition of some of his colleagues. [*Applause.*] He was here to-night to maintain this same right to free speech, and to express his views of the political condition of the country. It gave him pleasure to introduce to the audience Hon. Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Sumner, on taking the stand, was again greeted with loud and prolonged cheers. After tendering acknowledgments for the generous and cordial reception, and regretting his inability to express all he felt, he proceeded with his speech, which was thus described by the *Evening Post*: —

"Mr. Sumner was as happy in the manner as he was forcible in the matter of his speech. His commanding person, his distinct utterance, and his graceful elocution combined with the eloquence of his words in keeping the immense auditory to their seats for two hours, without a movement, and almost without a breath, save when the applause broke forth. It is the first time that Mr. Sumner has spoken in public since he was laid low in the Senate House, and New York, by this grand demonstration, has shown its eagerness to welcome him to the field of so many former triumphs."

In this speech Mr. Sumner sought to popularize his argument in the Senate on the Barbarism of Slavery, with an application to the Presidential election, and at the same time to reassert the positions he had there taken. Its influence was increased by the circulation it enjoyed. Besides the *Tribune*, *Times*, *Herald*, and *World*, which printed it in full, there was a pamphlet edition of more than fifty thousand copies circulated by the Young Men's Republican Union. The Secretary of the Republican Central Committee of California wrote, that this Committee, after publishing a large edition of the "Barbarism of Slavery," published ten thousand copies of the New York speech, which was "read with that attention which the subject elucidated by you readily commands." Among letters with regard to it, two are preserved as friendly voices.

Hon. W. H. Seward wrote from Auburn: —

"Your speech, in every part, is noble and great. Even you never spoke so well."

Another friend, who had not agreed with Mr. Sumner at an earlier period, George Livermore, the intelligent merchant of Boston, devoted to books as well as business, being in New York at the time, heard the speech, and, in a letter dated at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, wrote: —

"I can say in all sincerity, that, of all the political addresses I have ever heard, — and for thirty years past I have heard a great many, and from the most distinguished men in the country, — I have never listened to one that would begin to compare with this as a whole. The high and broad ground on which you based your views, the clearness and force with which you presented the subject, the dignity and grace of your manner, and the honest and hearty tone in which you uttered your thoughts, all together make your speech *the best one that was ever delivered*, as far as my knowledge and experience go."

These testimonies will at least explain the effect of this speech at the time.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF NEW YORK: —

OF all men in our history, there are two whose influence at this moment is peculiar. Though dead, they yet live, speak, and act in the conflict of principle which divides the country, — standing face to face, like two well-matched champions. When I add that one was from South Carolina and the other from Massachusetts, you cannot fail to see that I mean John C. Calhoun and John Quincy Adams.

Statesmen, both, of long career, marked ability, and unblemished integrity, — acting together at first, — sitting in the same Cabinet, from which they passed, one to become Vice-President, and the other President, — then, for the remainder of their days, battling in Congress, and dying there, — each was a leader in life, but each is now in death a greater leader still.

Mr. Calhoun possessed an intellect of much originality and boldness, and, though wanting the culture of a scholar, made himself felt in council and in debate. To native powers unlike, but not inferior, Mr. Adams

added the well-ripened fruits of long experience in foreign lands and of studies more various and complete than those of any other public man in our history, besides an indomitable will, and that spirit of freedom which inspired his father, when, in the Continental Congress, he so eloquently maintained the Declaration of Independence, making himself its Colossus on that floor.

Sitting together in the Cabinet of Mr. Monroe, they concurred in sanctioning the Missouri Prohibition of Slavery as constitutional, and so advised the President. But here divergence probably began, though for a long time not made manifest. The diary of Mr. Adams shows that at that early day, when Slavery had been little discussed, he saw its enormity with instinctive quickness, and described it with corresponding force. The record is less full with regard to Mr. Calhoun; but when they reappeared, one in the Senate, and the other in the House of Representatives, each openly assumed the position by which he will be known in history, — one as chief in all the pretensions of Slavery and Slave-Masters, the other as champion of Freedom.

Mr. Calhoun regarded Slavery as a permanent institution; Mr. Adams regarded it as something transitory. Mr. Calhoun vaunted it as a form of civilization; Mr. Adams scorned it as an unquestionable barbarism. Mr. Calhoun did not hesitate to call it the most stable basis of free government; Mr. Adams vehemently denounced it as a curse, full of weakness and mockery, doubly offensive in a boastful Republic. Mr. Calhoun, not content with exalting Slavery, proceeded to condemn the early opinions of Washington and Jefferson as "folly and delusion," to assail the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence as "absurd," and then to

proclaim that human beings are "property" under the Constitution, and, as such, may be transported into the Territories and there held in Slavery; while Mr. Adams added to the glory of his long and diversified career by persistent efforts which are better for his fame than having been President, — upholding the great rights of petition and of speech, — vindicating the early opinions of the Fathers, and the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence, — exposing the odious character of Slavery, — insisting upon its prohibition in the Territories, — denying the asserted property in man, — and especially, and often, exhibiting the unjust power in the National Government usurped by what he called "the little cluster" of Slave-Masters, whose yoke was to him intolerable.

Such, most briefly told, were antagonist opinions of these two chiefs. Never was great conflict destined to involve a great country more distinctly foreshadowed. All that the Republican party now opposes may be found in John C. Calhoun; all that the Republican party now maintains may be found in John Quincy Adams. Choose ye, fellow-citizens, between the two.

The rule of "Principles and not Men" is hardly applicable to a man whose name, bearing the sacred seal of death, has become the synonym of Principle; yet I do not hesitate to say that our cause is best appreciated in its precise objects and aims. Proud as we are to tread where John Quincy Adams leads the way, there is a guide of more commanding authority — found in the eternal law of Right, and the concurring mandate of the Constitution itself, when properly interpreted — that teaches the duties of a good citizen. Such is the guide of the Republican party, which, I say fearlessly,

where most known, will be most trusted, and, when understood in its origin, will be seen to be no accidental or fugitive organization, merely for an election, but an irresistible necessity, which in the nature of things must be permanent as the pretensions, moral and political, which it seeks to constrain and counteract.

All must admit, too, that, if no Republican party existed now, — even if that halcyon day had come, so often promised by cajoling politicians, when the Slavery Question was settled, — still there would be a political necessity for a great party of Opposition to act as check on the Administration. A kindred necessity was once expressed by an eminent British statesman, who gave as a toast, "A strong Administration and a strong Opposition." Parties are unknown in despotic countries. They belong to the machinery of free governments. Through parties public opinion is concentrated and directed; through parties principles are maintained above men; and through parties men in power are held to a just responsibility. If ever there was occasion for such a party, it is now, when the corruptions of the Administration are dragged to light by Committees of Congress. On this ground alone good men might be summoned to rescue the government of our country.

It is an attested fact that Mr. Buchanan became President through corruption. Money, familiarly known as a "corruption fund," first distilled in small drippings from clerks and petty officials, was swollen by larger contributions of merchants and contractors, and with this accumulation votes were purchased in Philadelphia, enough to turn the election in that great metropolis, and in the chain of cause and effect to assure

the triumph of the Democratic candidate. I speak now only what is proved. Fraudulent naturalization papers in blank, by which this was perpetrated, were produced before a Committee of Congress. It was natural that an Administration thus corrupt in origin should continue to exercise power through the same corruption by which power was gained; but nothing else than that insensibility to acts of shame produced by familiarity can explain how all this has been done with such absolute indecency of exposure, so as to recall the words of the poet, —

"How use doth breed a habit in a man!"

A letter from a local politician, addressed to the President himself, urging without disguise the giving of a large contract for machinery to a particular house in Philadelphia, employing four hundred and fifty mechanics, with a view to the approaching election, was sent to the Secretary of the Navy, with this indorsement, in a well-known handwriting, signed by well-known initials: "Sept. 15, 1858. The enclosed letter from Colonel Patterson, of Philadelphia, is submitted to the attention of the Secretary of the Navy. J. B." Thus did the President of the United States, in formal written words, now of record in the history of the country, recommend the employment of the public money, set apart for the public service, to influence an election. Here was criminality as positive as when his supporters purchased votes in the streets. From one learn all; and from such a characteristic instance learn the character of the Administration. But there are other well-known instances; and the testimony before the Congressional Committees discloses the President on Sundays in secret conclave with one of his corrupt agents, piously

occupied discussing the chances of an election, and how its expenses were to be met, while, at the same time, like another Joseph Surface, he was uttering in public "fine sentiments" of political morality, and lamenting the prevalence of the very indecencies in which he was engaged.

It was natural that a President, who, with professions of purity on the lips, made himself the pander of such vulgar corruption, should stick at nothing needful to carry his purposes. I shall not dwell on the Lecompton Constitution; but it belongs to this chapter. You all know its wickedness. Concocted originally at Washington, with the single purpose of fastening Slavery upon the people of Kansas, it was by execrable contrivance so arranged as to prevent the people, when about to become a State, from voting on that question. Next sanctioned by a convention of usurpers, who in no respect represented the people of Kansas, then fraudulently submitted to the people for their votes, it was fraudulently adopted by stuffing ballot-boxes on a scale never before known. Thus, at the Delaware Crossing, where there were but forty-three legal voters, four hundred were returned; at Oxford, where there were but forty-two legal voters, a thousand were returned; and at Shawnee, where there were but forty legal voters, twelve hundred were returned. And yet this Constitution, disowned by the very Governor who had gone to Kansas as agent of the President, — rotten with corruption, gaping with falsehood, and steaming with iniquity, — was at once recognized by the President, urged upon Congress in a special message, and pressed for adoption by all the appliances of unprincipled power. If the words of Jugurtha, turning his back

upon Rome, cannot be repeated, that the Republic is for sale, and soon to perish, if it shall find a purchaser,[1] nor the sharper saying of Walpole, that every man has his price, it was not from any forbearance in the President. A single editor was offered the printing of Post-Office blanks worth at least eighty thousand dollars, if by an article no larger than a man's hand he would show submission to the Administration. Bribes of office were added to bribes of money. As the votes of electors had been purchased to make Mr. Buchanan President, the votes of Representatives were now solicited to carry out his scheme of corruption, and the Halls of Congress were changed into a political market-house, where men were bought by the head. Is not all this enough to arouse the indignation of the people?

It is true that the President, whose power began in corruption, and who is responsible author of the corruption by which his administration has been debased, is no longer a candidate for office. Already judgment begins. His own political party discards him. The first avenging blow is struck. Incorruptible history will do the rest. The tablet conspicuously erected in Genoa to expose the crimes of certain Doges, branding one as *Fur Magnus* and another as *Maximus Latronum*, will not be needed here. The exposed corrupter, the tyrant enslaver, and the robber of Human Freedom cannot be forgotten. Unhappy President! after a long career of public service, not only tossed aside, but tossed over to perpetual memory as an example to be shunned! Better for him the oblivion of common life than the bad fame he has won!

[1] "Urbem venalem et mature perituram, si emtorem invenerit." — Sallust, Jugurtha, c. 35.

But, though not himself a candidate for office, his peculiar supporters, animated by his spirit, linked with him in misrule, are embodied as a party, and ask your votes. Simply to resist this combination, and to save the Republic from its degrading influence, would justify the formation of the Republican party; and I doubt not that there are many who will be content to unite with us on this ground alone, anxious to put the National Government once again in pure hands. To all such, welcome!

While this consummation necessarily enters into the present purposes of the Republican party, while we naturally begin by insisting upon purity in the Government, and make this one of our urgent demands, it is obvious that the quickening impulse of the party is to be found in other purposes, which cannot pass away in a single election. The Republican party seeks to overthrow the Slave Oligarchy in the National Government, and especially at this moment to stay its aggressions in the Territories, which, through a corrupt interpretation of the Constitution, it threatens to barbarize with Slavery. But all who seek purity in the National Government must unite in this purpose; for only by the overthrow of this base Oligarchy, which, beginning in the denial of all human rights, necessarily shows itself in barbarism and villany of all kinds, can a better order prevail. It is out of Slavery that all our griefs proceed; nor can the offences of the present Administration be fully comprehended without considering the nature of this Evil, and its chronic influence over our Government, reaching everywhere by subtle agencies, or more subtle, far-reaching example, but still in itself the original and all-sufficient activity. As well attempt to

explain the Gulf Stream without the Gulf of Mexico, or the Origin of Evil without the human heart, as attempt to explain the present degraded character of the National Government without Slavery. As well attempt the play of "Othello" without the Moor. And permit me to say that our warfare with these iniquities will be feeble, unless we attack them in their origin.

At the beginning of our history Slavery was universally admitted to be an Evil. Nobody then so hardy as to vindicate it. In the Convention which framed the Constitution it was branded as "a nefarious institution," or more mildly called "wrong"; and these generous voices came from the South as well as from the North. Out of the Convention there was a similar accord. I shall not quote the words of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, or Jay, for they are familiar to all. Even as they spoke others spoke, and I might occupy the whole evening simply reciting this testimony. Nor were these declarations confined to public life. The Colleges all, by definite action, arrayed themselves against Slavery, especially the University of William and Mary, in Virginia, which conferred upon Granville Sharp, the acknowledged chief of British Abolitionists, the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. The Literature of the land, such as it was, agreed with the Colleges. The Church, too, added its powerful voice; and here, amid diversities of religious faith, we hail that unity of spirit which animated all. Quakers, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists seemed to vie with each other in this pious testimony.

The Constitution was adopted, but the word Slave

was not allowed to pollute its text; and this was in declared deference to the prevailing opinion, which regarded Slavery as temporary, destined soon to pass away. All looked to the glad day as almost at hand. In harmony with this expectation, Slavery was prohibited in all existing territories of the Union, so that, when Washington, as first President of the United States, at his inauguration here in New York took his first oath to support the Constitution, the flag of the Republic nowhere on the land within the jurisdiction of Congress covered a single slave. Little then did the Fathers dream that the Evil which they regarded with shame and exerted themselves to prohibit would elevate its obscene crest as it now does, and flaunt its monstrous pretensions before the world. Little did they dream that the Constitution, from which they had carefully excluded the very *word*, would be held, in defiance of reason and common sense, to protect the *thing*, so exceptionally that it could not be reached by Congressional prohibition, even within Congressional jurisdiction. Little did they dream that the text, which they left so pure and healthful, would, through corrupt interpretation, be swollen into such an offensive Elephantiasis.

Two circumstances, civilizing in themselves, exercised an unexpected influence for American Slavery: first, the abolition of the slave-trade, which by taking away the supply increased the value of slaves; and, secondly, the increased cultivation of cotton, stimulated by the invention of new machinery. The latter has been of especial moment. Indeed, it is hardly too much to say that out of this slender cotton fibre are formed the manacles of the slave. Thus, through sinister activity, and the

wickedness of men, is good made the minister of wrong. Next after Christopher Columbus, who by sublime enterprise opened a pathway to the New World, Eli Whitney, who discovered the cotton gin, has been indirectly and unconsciously a chief agent in the bondage of the African race on the North American continent; and surely proper gratitude for the advantages we enjoy in such large store from these two discoveries must prompt us to increased activity for the welfare of those who, alas! have been such losers, where we have been such gainers.

The change of opinion, so disastrous in result, was gradual. Though in its successive stages easily detected by the careful inquirer, it did not become manifest to the whole country till 1820, when it burst forth in the Missouri Question. Then, for the first time, Slavery showed itself openly violent, insolent, belligerent. Freedom was checked, but saved something by a compromise, — announced, at the moment of its adoption, by Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, as a triumph of the South, — where, in consideration of the admission of Missouri as a Slave State, thus securing additional preponderance to the Slave Power, it was stipulated that Slavery should be prohibited in certain outlying territory, at that time trodden only by savages. Then came a lull, during which the change was still at work, until, contemporaneously with the abolition of Slavery in the British West Indies, the discussion was lighted anew. Meanwhile slaves augmented in price, and slave-masters became more decided. In timid deference to the world, they at first ventured no defence of Slavery in the abstract; but at last, bolder grown under the lead of Mr. Calhoun, they threw aside all reserve, openly

assailed the opinions of the Fathers, audaciously denied the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence, and by formal resolution asserted the new dogma of Slavery in the Territories. This was as late as 1847. A letter of that day, from Mr. Calhoun, addressed to a member of the Alabama Legislature, shows that there was an element of policy in this exaggeration. His desire was "to force the Slavery issue" on the North, believing that delay was dangerous, as the Slave-Masters were then relatively stronger, both morally and politically, than they would ever be again.

At last the end has come. Slavery is openly pronounced, at one time, the black marble keystone of our National Arch, — at another time, the corner-stone of our Republican edifice; then it is vaunted as the highest type of civilization, — then as a blessing to the master as well as the slave, — and then again as ennobling to the master, if not to the slave. It is only the first step which costs, and therefore the authors of these opinions, so shocking to the moral sense, do not hesitate at other opinions equally shocking to the reason, even to the extent of finding impossible sanctions for Slavery in the Constitution. Listening to these extravagances, who would not exclaim, with Ben Jonson in the play? —

> "Grave fathers, he 's possessed; again I say,
> Possessed: nay, if there be possession and
> Obsession, he has both." [1]

And now, fellow-citizens, what is Slavery? This is no question of curiosity or philanthropy merely; for when the National Government, which you and I at the North help to constitute, is degraded to be its in-

[1] The Fox, Act V. sc. 8.

strument, and all the National Territories are proclaimed open to its Barbarism, and the Constitution itself is perverted to its support, the whole subject naturally, logically, and necessarily enters into our discussion. It cannot be avoided; it cannot be blinked out of sight. Nay, you must pass upon it by your votes at the coming election. Futile is the plea that we at the North have nothing to do with Slavery. Granted that we have nothing to do with it in the States, we have much to do with all its irrational assumptions under the Constitution, and just so long as these are urged must Slavery be discussed. It must be laid bare in its enormity, precisely as though it were proposed to plant it here in the streets of New York. Nor can such a wrong — foul in itself, and fouler still in pretensions — be dealt with tamely. Tameness is surrender. And charity, too, may be misapplied. Forgiving those who trespass against us, I know not if we are called to forgive those who trespass against others, — to forgive those who trespass against the Republic, — to forgive those who trespass against Civilization, — to forgive those who trespass against a whole race, — to forgive those who trespass against the universal Human Family, — finally, to forgive those who trespass against God. Such trespassers exist among us, possessing the organization of party, holding the control of the National Government, constituting a colossal Power, and

> "what seems its head
> The likeness of a *President* has on."

Surely, if ever there was a moment when every faculty should be bent to the service, and all invigorated by an inspiring zeal, it is now, while the battle between Civilization and Barbarism is still undecided, and you

are summoned to resist the last desperate shock. To this work I am not equal; but I do not shrink from the duties of my post. Alas! human language is gentle, and the human voice is weak. Words only are mine, when I ought to command thunderbolts. Voice only is mine, when, like the ancient Athenian, I ought to carry the weapons of Zeus on the tongue. Nor would I transcend any just rule of moderation, or urge this warfare too far among persons. Humbly do I recognize the authority of Him, who, when reviled, reviled not again; but this divine example teaches me to expose crime, and not to hesitate, though the Scribes and Pharisees, chief-priests and money-changers, cry out. And it shows how words of invective may come from lips of peace. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." Thus spake the Saviour in Jerusalem; and he still speaks, not in Jerusalem only, but wherever men are won from truth, wherever crime exists to be exposed and denounced.

What, then, I repeat, is Slavery? The occasion forbids detail; but enough must be presented to place this outrage in its true light, — as something worse even than a constant state of war, where the master is constant aggressor. Here I put aside for the moment all the tales which reach us from the house of bondage, — all the cumulative, crushing testimony, from slaves and masters alike, — all the barbarous incidents which help to arouse a yet too feeble indignation, — in short, all the glimpses which come to us from this mighty Bluebeard's chamber. All these I put aside, not because they are of little moment in exhibiting the true char-

acter of Slavery, but because I desire to arraign Slavery on grounds above all controversy, impeachment, or suspicion, even from Slave-Masters themselves. Not on wonderful story, where the genius of woman has prevailed, not even on indisputable facts, do I now accuse Slavery, but on its character as revealed in its own simple definition of itself. Out of its own mouth do I condemn it.

By the *Law of Slavery*, man, created in the image of God, fearfully and wonderfully made, with sensibilities of pleasure and pain, with sentiments of love, with aspirations for improvement, with a sense of property, and with a soul like ourselves, is despoiled of his human character, and declared to be a mere *chattel*, "to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." I do not stop to give at length all its odious words; you are doubtless familiar with them. The heathen idea of Aristotle is repeated, — "a tool with a soul."[1] But in this simple definition is contained the whole incalculable wrong of Slavery; for out of it, as from an inexhaustible fountain, are derived all the unrighteous prerogatives of the master. These are five in number, and I know not which is most revolting.

First, there is the pretension that *man can hold property in man*, — forgetful, that, by a law older than all human law, foremost stands the indefeasible right of every man to himself.

Secondly, *the absolute nullification of the relation of husband and wife*, so that all who are called slaves are delivered over to concubinage or prostitution, it may be with each other, or it may be with their masters; but with whomsoever it may be, it is the same, for with

[1] Politics, Book I. ch. 4.

slaves marriage is impossible, as they are merely "coupled," never married.

Thirdly, *the utter rejection of the relation of parent and child;* for the infant legally belongs, not to the mother who bore it, but to the master who bought it.

Fourthly, *the complete denial of instruction;* for the master may always, at his own rude discretion, prevent his victim from learning to read, and thus shut against him those gates of knowledge which open such vistas on earth and in heaven.

Fifthly, *the wholesale robbery of the labor of another, and of all its fruits,* — forgetful, that, by the same original law under which every man has a title to himself, he has also a title to the fruits of his own labor, amounting in itself to a sacred property, which no person, howsoever called, whether despot or master, can righteously appropriate.

Such are the five essential elements of Slavery. Look at them, and you will confess that this institution stands forth as a hateful assemblage of unquestionable wrongs under sanction of existing law. Take away any one of these, and just to that extent Slavery ceases to exist. Take away all, and the Slavery Question will be settled. But this assemblage becomes more hateful still, when its unmistakable *single motive* is detected, which is simply *to compel labor without wages.* Incredible as it may be, it cannot be denied that the right of a man to himself, the right of a husband to his wife, the right of a parent to his child, the right of a man to instruction, the right of a man to the fruits of his own labor, all these supreme rights, by the side of which other rights seem petty, are trampled down in order to organize that *five-headed* selfish-

ness, practically maintained by the lash, which, look at it as you will, has for its single object COMPULSORY LABOR WITHOUT WAGES.

Obviously and unquestionably the good of all is against such a system; nor, except for the pretended property of the master, and his selfish interest, could there be any color for it. That Slavery thus constituted can be good for the master is one of the hallucinations of the system, — something like the hallucination of the opium-eater. Fascinating, possibly, it may be for a time, but debasing and destructive it must be in the end. "I agree with Mr. Boswell," said Dr. Johnson, "that there must be high satisfaction in being a feudal lord"; but the moralist did not consider this a good reason for such a power at the expense of others.[1] That Slave-Masters should be violent and tyrannical, that they should be regardless of all rights, especially where Slavery is concerned, and that the higher virtues of character should fail in them, — all this might be inferred, even in the absence of evidence, according to irresistible law of cause and effect. No man can do injustice with impunity. He may not suffer in worldly condition, but he must suffer in his own nature. And the very unconsciousness in which he lives aggravates the unhappy influence. Nor can familiarity with Slavery fail to harden the heart.

Persons become accustomed to scenes of brutality, till they witness them with indifference. Hogarth, that master of human nature, portrayed this tendency in his picture of a dissection at a medical college, where the president maintains the dignity of insensibility over a

[1] Boswell, Life of Johnson, April 6, 1772, ed. Croker (London, 1885,) Vol. III. p. 212.

corpse, which he regards simply as the subject of a lecture. And Horace Walpole, who admired the satire of this picture, finds in it illustration of the idea, that "the legal habitude of viewing shocking scenes hardens the human mind, and renders it unfeeling."[1] This simple truth, in its most general application, exhibits the condition of the Slave-Master. How can he show sensibility for the common rights of fellow-citizens who sacrifices daily the most sacred rights of others merely to secure *labor without wages?* With him a false standard is necessarily established, bringing with it a blunted moral sense and clouded perceptions, so that, when he does something intrinsically barbarous or mean, he does not blush at the recital.

Here, again, I forbear all detail. The reason of the intellect blending with the reason of the heart, the testimony of history fortified by the testimony of good men, an array of unerring figures linked with an array of unerring facts, — these all I might employ. And I might proceed to show how this barbarous influence, beginning on the plantation, diffuses itself throughout society, enters into official conduct, and even mounts into Congress, where for a long time it has exercised a vulgar domination, trampling not only on all the amenities of debate, but absolutely on Parliamentary Law. I shall not open this chapter.

There is one frightful circumstance, unhappily of frequent occurrence, which proclaims so clearly the character of the social system bred by Slavery, that I shall be pardoned for adducing it. I refer to the roasting of slaves alive at the stake. One was roasted very recently, — not after public trial, according to the forms

[1] Anecdotes of Painting in England: *Hogarth*, p. 728.

of law, as at the fires of Smithfield, but by a lawless crowd, suddenly assembled, who in this way made themselves ministers of a cruel vengeance. This Barbarism, which seems to have become part of the customary Law of Slavery, may well cover us all with humiliation, when we reflect that it is already renounced by the copper-colored savages of our continent, while during the present century more instances of it have occurred among our Slave-Masters than we know among the former since that early day when Captain Smith was saved from sacrifice by the tenderness of Pocahontas. Perhaps no other usage reveals with such fearful distinctness the deep-seated, pervading influence of Slavery, offensive to Civilization, hostile to Law itself, by virtue of which it pretends to live, insulting to humanity, shocking to decency, and utterly heedless of all rights, forms, or observances, in the maintenance of its wicked power. Here I add, that the proportion of slave to free is not without influence in determining treatment. Fear is a constant tyrant, with an inhumanity which does not tire or sleep, and nothing can quicken its cruelty more than the dread of vengeance for the multitudinous wrong done to the slave.

I would not be unjust to Slave-Masters. Some there are, I doubt not, of happy natures, uncorrupted by the possession of tyrannical power, who render the condition of their slaves endurable, and in private virtues emulate the graces of Civilization; but the good in these cases comes from the masters, *notwithstanding* Slavery. And, besides, there are the great examples of the Fathers, who, looking down upon Slavery and regarding it as an Evil, were saved from its contamination. To all these I render heartfelt homage. But their

exceptional virtues cannot save the essential wrong which I expose. Nor am I blinded by the blandishments of that wealth which is the fruit of Slavery. With abhorrence we read of the scandalous man-traffic by which a Hessian prince of Germany sold his subjects to be used by George the Third against our fathers; and we share the contempt expressed by Frederick, surnamed the Great, when he levied on these victims, passing through his dominions, the customary toll for so many head of cattle, since, as he said, they had been sold as such; and even now the traveller turns with disgust from the pleasant slopes of the ducal garden which was adorned by these unholy gains.[1] But all this, and more, must be renewed in our minds, when we think of American Slavery, with the houses and gardens decorated by its sweat.

Such, fellow-citizens, is Slavery, as manifest in its law, and also in its influence on society. Bad as it is, if it modestly kept at home, if it did not stalk into the National jurisdiction and enter into the National Government, *within reach of our votes*, I should not summon you on this occasion to unite against it; for, whatever the promptings of sympathy and of godlike philanthropy, nothing is clearer than that our political duties depend simply upon our political responsibilities; and since we are not politically responsible for Slavery in Charleston, or in Constantinople, so in neither place have we any political duties in regard to it. Lament it, wherever it exists, we must, and surround its victims with our prayers; but our action, while in-

[1] Here was the prison of the Emperor Louis Napoleon, after his defeat and surrender at Sedan, September 1, 1870.

spired by these sentiments, must rest within the bounds of Law and Constitution.

Here the field is ample. Indeed, if Slavery existed nowhere within the national jurisdiction, our duty would still be urgent to grapple with that pernicious influence, which, through an *Oligarchical Combination* of Slave-Masters, unknown to the Constitution, never anticipated by its founders, and in defiance of their example, has entered into and possessed the National Government, like an Evil Spirit. This influence, which, wielding at will all the powers of the National Government, even those of the Judiciary, has become formidable to Freedom everywhere, clutching violently at the Territories, and menacing the Free States, — as witness the claim, still undecided in the court of the last resort, so audaciously presented by a citizen of Virginia, to hold slaves in New York on the way to Texas; this influence, now so vaulting, was for a long time unobserved, even while exercising a controlling power. At first timid and shy, from undoubted sense of guilt, it avoided discussion, yet was determined in its policy. The Southern Senator who boasted that for sixty years the Slave States had governed the country knew well their constant inferiority to the Free States in population, wealth, manufactures, commerce, schools, churches, libraries, and all the activities of a true Civilization, — knew well that they had contributed nothing to the literature of the country, even in Political Economy and the science of Government, which they have so vehemently professed, except the now forgotten "forty bale theory," [1] — knew well that by no principle

[1] This was the special thunder of Mr. McDuffie in the debates on the Tariff during the administration of General Jackson.

of justice could this long predominance be explained; but he forgot to confess the secret agency. Though unseen, Slavery was present always with decisive influence. No matter what the question, it was the same. Once the Free States inclined to Free Trade, but the Slave States went the other way; but when the former inclined towards Protection, the Slave Power in the dark behind dictated Free Trade, and so it has been till now. Here is the subtle ruling influence, against which population, wealth, manufactures, commerce, schools, churches, libraries, and all the activities of a true Civilization are impotent. The Slave Power is always master, and it is this Power which for sixty years, according to the boast of the Senator, has governed this broad and growing country, doing what it pleases, and penetrating far-away places, while it sacrifices all who will not do its bidding.

The actual number of slaveholders was for a long time unknown, and on this account was naturally exaggerated It was often represented very great. On one occasion, a distinguished representative from Massachusetts, whose name will be ever cherished for devotion to Human Rights, — I mean the late Horace Mann, — was rudely interrupted on the floor of Congress by a member from Alabama, who averred that the number of slaveholders was as many as three millions.[1] At

[1] "MR. MANN. . . . . I have seen the number of *actual slaveholders* variously estimated; but the highest estimate I have ever seen is three hundred thousand. . . . .

"MR. GAYLE, of Alabama, interrupted, and said: If the gentleman from Massachusetts has been informed that the number of slaveholders is only three hundred thousand, then I will tell him his information is utterly false.

"MR. MANN. Will the gentleman tell me how many there are?

"MR. GAYLE. Ten times as many."

Cong. Globe, 30th Cong. 1st Sess., App., p. 835, June 30, 1848.

that time there was no official document by which this extravagance could be corrected. But at last we have it. The late census, taken in 1850, shows that the whole number of this peculiar class, all told, so unfortunate as to hold slaves, was only 347,525;[1] and of this number the larger part are small slaveholders, leaving only 92,000 persons as owners of the great mass of slaves, and substantial representatives of this class. And yet this small Oligarchy, odious in origin, without any foundation in that justice which is the essential base of every civilized association, stuck together only by confederacy in all the *five-headed* wrong of Slavery, and constituting in itself what in other days was called *Magnum Latrocinium*, has, by confession of one of its own leaders, for sixty years governed the Republic. To this end two things have concurred: first, its associated wealth, being the asserted value of its human flesh, constituting a flagitious capital of near two thousand millions of dollars; and, secondly, its peculiar representation in the House of Representatives, where, under the three-fifths rule of the Constitution, ninety members actually hold their seats by virtue in part of this in-

[1] Distributed according to the following table: —

Holders of a single slave						68,820
" "	1	and	under	5		105,688
" "	5	"	"	10		80,765
" "	10	"	"	20		54,595
" "	20	"	"	50		29,733
" "	50	"	"	100		6,196
" "	100	"	"	200		1,479
" "	200	"	"	300		187
" "	300	"	"	500		56
" "	500	"	"	1000		9
" "	1000	and	over			2
Total						347,525

De Bow's *Compendium of the Seventh Census*, p. 95.

defensible property. Thus are our Slave-Masters an enormous Corporation, or Joint-Stock Company, by the side of which the United States Bank, with its petty thirty millions of capital, and without any peculiar representation, is dwarfed into insignificance.

All tyranny, like murder, is foul at the best; but this is most foul, strange, and unnatural, especially when it is considered that the States occupied by the Slave Oligarchy are far below the Free States in resources of all kinds. By the last census there was in the Free States a solid population of freemen amounting to upwards of thirteen millions, while in the Slave States there was a like population of only six millions. In other respects, important to Civilization, the disparity was as great, — all of which I have amply shown elsewhere. And yet from the beginning this Oligarchy has taken the lion's share among the honors and trusts of the Republic, while it entered into and possessed both the old political parties, Whig and Democrat, — as witness their servile resolutions always, — making them one in subserviency, though double in form, and renewing in them the mystery of the Siamese twins, which, though separate in body and different in name, are constrained by an unnatural ligament to a community of exertion.

I feel humbled, when I dwell on the amazing disproportion of offices usurped by this Oligarchy. From the beginning, all the great posts of the Republic — Presidency, Vice-Presidency, seats in the Cabinet, seats in the Supreme Court, Presidency of the Senate, Speakership — seem to be almost perpetually in their hands. At this moment, the Free States, with double the population of the Slave States, have only four out of nine

Justices of the Supreme Court; and of these four, it must be said, three are Northern men with Southern principles. And in the humbler places at the Departments the same extraordinary disproportion prevails. Out of the whole number there employed, 787 are from the Slave States and District of Columbia, and 441 from the Free States, but mostly with Southern principles. These instances are typical. There is nothing in the National Government which the Oligarchy does not appropriate. Down to our day it has held the keys of every office, from President to the humblest postmaster, compelling all to do its bidding. It makes Cabinets, — organizes Courts, — directs the Army and Navy, — manages every department of public business, — presides over the Census, — conducts the Smithsonian Institution, founded by the generous charity of a foreigner to promote the interests of mankind, — and subsidizes the national press, alike in the national capital and in the remotest village of the North.

Mounting the marble steps of the Capitol, it takes the chair of the President of the Senate, also the chair of the Speaker of the House, then arranges the Committees of both bodies, placing at their head only servitors of Slavery, and excluding friends of Freedom, though entitled to such places by personal character and the States they represent; and thus it controls the national legislation. From the Capitol to the most distant confines, the whole country is enslaved. The Mahometan priest turns in prayer towards Mecca, his pulpit is on the side which fronts towards Mecca, his auditors face towards Mecca. But Slavery is our Mecca, towards which everything turns, everything fronts, everything faces.

In maintaining its power the Slave Oligarchy applies a test for office very different from that of Jefferson: "Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?" These things are all forgotten now in the single question, signalizing the great change which has taken place, "Is he faithful to Slavery?" With arrogant ostracism, it excludes from every national office all who cannot respond to this test, thus surrounding and blockading every avenue of power. So complete and offensive has this tyranny become, that at this moment, while I am speaking, could Washington, or Jefferson, or Franklin, or John Jay, once more descend from his sphere above, to mingle in our affairs, and bless us with his wisdom, not one of them, with his recorded, *unretracted* opinions on Slavery, could receive a nomination for the Presidency from either fraction of the divided Democratic party, or from that other political combination known as the Union party, — nor, stranger still, could either of these sainted patriots, whose names alone open a perpetual fountain of gratitude in all your hearts, be confirmed by the Senate of the United States for any political function whatever, not even for the local office of Postmaster. What I now say, amid your natural astonishment, I have said often in addressing the people, and more than once from my seat in the Senate, and no man there has made answer, for no man who has sat in its secret sessions, and observed the test practically applied, could make answer; and I ask you to accept this statement as my testimony, derived from the experience which is my lot. Yes, fellow-citizens, had this test prevailed in the earlier days, Washington, "first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen," could

not have been created Generalissimo of the American forces, Jefferson could not have taken his place on the Committee to draft the Declaration of Independence, and Franklin could not have gone forth to France, with the commission of the infant Republic, to secure the invaluable alliance of that ancient kingdom, — nor could John Jay, as first Chief Justice, have lent to our judiciary the benignant grace of his name and character.

Standing on the bent necks of an enslaved race, with four millions of human beings as the black marble Caryatides to support its power, the Slave Oligarchy erects itself into a lordly caste which brooks no opposition. But when I speak of Caste, I mean nothing truly polite; and when I speak of Oligarchy, I mean nothing truly aristocratic. As despotism is simply an abuse of monarchy, so Oligarchy is simply an abuse of aristocracy, unless it be that most vulgar of all, "aristocracy of the skin." Derived from Slavery, and having the interests of Slavery always in mind, our Oligarchy must naturally take its character from this *five-headed* wrong.

"Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill."

All that is bad in Slavery, its audacity, its immorality, its cruelty, its robbery, its meanness, its ignorance, its barbarous disregard of human rights, and its barbarous disregard of every obligation, must all be reproduced in its representative. If the Oligarchy hesitates at nothing to serve its selfish ends, it simply acts in harmony with Slavery, from which it draws its life-blood. If in grasp of power it is like the hunchback Richard, if in falsehood it copies Iago, and if in character it is low as the brutish Caliban,

> "Which any print of goodness will not take,
> Being capable of all ill," —

ay, if in all these respects it surpasses its various prototypes, — if in steady baseness, in uniform brutality, and consummate wickedness it is without a peer, be not astonished, fellow-citizens, for it acts simply according to the original law of its birth and the inborn necessities of its being. With all these unprecedented qualities and aptitudes combined into one intense activity, it goes where it will and does what it pleases. The Pterodactyl of an early geological period, formed for all service and every element, with neck of bird, mouth of reptile, wing of bat, body of mammifer, and with hugest eye, so that it could seek its prey in the night, — such was the ancient and extinct kindred of this Oligarchy, which, like Milton's fiend,

> "O'er bog or steep, through strait, rough, dense, or rare,
> With head, hands, wings, or feet pursues his way,
> And swims, or sinks, or wades, or creeps, or flies."

The soul sickens in contemplating the acts of dishonest tyranny perpetrated by this lordly power. I cannot give their prolonged history now. But looking at the old Missouri Compromise, founded on the admission of Missouri as a Slave State, and in consideration thereof the Prohibition of Slavery in other outlying territory, and seeing how, after an acquiescence of thirty-four years, and the irreclaimable possession by Slavery of its especial share in the provisions of this Compromise, in violation of every obligation of honor, compact, and good neighborhood, and in contemptuous disregard of the outgushing sentiments of an aroused North, this time-honored Prohibition was overturned, and the vast region now known as Kansas and Nebraska

opened to Slavery, — looking next at the juggling bill by which this was accomplished, declaring that its object was to leave the people "perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," and seeing how, in spite of these express words, the courageous settlers there were left a prey to invading hordes from Missouri, who, entering the Territory, organized a Usurpation which by positive law proceeded to fasten Slavery upon that beautiful soil, and to surround it with a code of death, so strict, that the famous bell which once swung in the steeple over the Hall of Independence at Philadelphia would be nothing but a nuisance in Kansas, while its immortal inscription, "Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof," would be an offence, and the sexton who rang the bell a criminal, — looking at the Lecompton Constitution, that masterpiece of wicked contrivance, by which this same people, in organizing a State, were fraudulently prevented from passing upon the question of Slavery, and seeing how the infamous counterfeit, though repudiated by the people, was openly adopted by the President, and by him corruptly urged upon Congress, with all the power of his Administration, — looking at these things, so recent and menacing, I feel how vain it is to expect truce or compromise with the Slave Oligarchy. Punic in faith, as in fear, no compact can bind it, while all interpretations of the Constitution friendly to Freedom, though sanctioned by Court and Congress in continuous precedent, are unceremoniously rejected. Faust, in the profound poem of Goethe, on being told that in Hell itself the laws prevail, says: —

> "Now that I like: so, then, one may, in fact,
> Conclude a binding compact with you, gentry!"

To which Mephistopheles replies: —

> "Whatever promise in our books finds entry
> We strictly carry into act."

But no compact or promise binds our gentry, although entered again and again in their books.

According to a famous saying, Russia is a "despotism tempered by assassination"; but even the steel of Brutus, refulgent in the Capitol, without the supplementary fulfilment of the wish of Caligula, that all should have a single life, must fail to reach our despotism, which in numbers enjoys an immunity beyond any solitary tyrant. Surely, if the Oligarchy is to live yet longer, its badges should symbolize its peculiar despotism born of Slavery. The coin, seal, and flag must be changed. Let the eagle be removed, giving place to the foul vulture with vulgar beak and filthy claw, — how unlike that bird of Jove, with ample pinion, and those mighty pounces, holding the dread thunderbolt and better olive of peace! — and instead of these, let there be fetter and lash, borrowed from the plantation, which is the miniature of the broader plantation to which the Republic is reduced. That appearance may be according to reality, and that we may not seem what we are not, this at least must be done. Abandon, too, the stars and stripes, — the stars numbering the present Union, the stripes numbering that Union which gave to mankind the Declaration of Independence with immortal truth; and let these also be replaced by the universal fetter and lash, for here is typified our Oligarchy, in all present power, as in all vital principle. Fetter and lash! The schoolboy shall grow up honoring the chosen emblems; the citizen shall hail them with sympathetic pride; the Republic shall be known

by them on coin, seal, and flag; while the ruler of the subjugated land, no longer President, shall be called Overseer.

Of course, fellow-citizens, you are now ready to see that the corruptions by which the present Administration is degraded are the natural offspring of slaveholding immorality. They have all concurred in sustaining the policy of the Oligarchy, and in the case of the Lecompton Constitution in direct effort to fasten Slavery upon a distant Territory, and they are all marked by the effrontery of Slavery. There is also its vulgarity; but this is natural; for is not pretension a fruitful source of vulgarity? and, pray, what is Slavery, but an enormous Pretension? Smollett attributes the peculiar profligacy of England at a particular period to the demoralization of the South Sea Bubble; but what is such a fugitive influence, compared with Slavery, which, indeed, if it were not a crime, might well be called a Bubble? A Government which vindicates the sale of human beings need not hesitate to purchase votes, whether at the polls or in Congress. The two transactions belong to the same family, though unquestionably the last is the least reprehensible.

Fellow-citizens, — And now we are brought to the practical bearing of this statement. Beyond all doubt your souls rise in judgment against these things. Beyond all doubt you are saddened at the shadow which they cast over the land. Beyond all doubt you are unwilling to bear any responsibility for their longer continuance. But this is not enough. There must be opposition, active, constant, perpetual; and this is the

foremost duty of patriotism. From the virtuous Reformer, Wycliffe, whose name illumines the earlier period of English history, we learn that men are sharers in evil deeds who from "coward dumbness" fail to oppose them. There can be no such coward dumbness now. Happily, a political party is at hand whose purpose is to combine and direct all generous energies for the salvation of the country.

Would you arrest these terrible corruptions, and the disastrous influence from which they spring, involving nothing less than civilization on this continent, the Republican party tells you how, and, in telling you how, vindicates at once its Origin and its Necessity. The work must be done, and there is no other organization by which it can be done. A party with such an origin and such a necessity cannot be for a day, or for this election only. It cannot be less permanent than the hostile influence which it is formed to counteract. Therefore, just so long as the present false theories of Slavery prevail, whether concerning its character, morally, economically, and socially, or concerning its prerogatives under the Constitution, and just so long as the Slave Oligarchy, which is the sleepless and unhesitating agent of Slavery in all its pretensions, continues to exist as a political power, the Republican party must endure. If bad men conspire for Slavery, good men must combine for Freedom; nor can the Holy War be ended, until the Barbarism now dominant in the Republic is overthrown, and the Pagan power is driven from our Jerusalem. And when this triumph is won, securing the immediate object of our organization, the Republican party will not die, but, purified by long contest with Slavery, and filled with higher

life, it will be lifted to yet other efforts for the good of man.

At present the work is plain before us. It is simply to elect our candidates: Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, whose ability, so conspicuously shown in his own State, attracted at once the admiration of the whole country, whose character no breath has touched, and whose heart is large enough to embrace the broad Republic and all its people, — him you will elect President; and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, whose clear head, firm principles, and ample experience none who sit with him in the Senate Chamber can contest, — him you will elect Vice-President. Electing these, we shall put the National Government, at least in its Executive department, openly and actively on the side of Freedom; and this alone will be of incalculable influence, not only in itself, but as harbinger of the Future.

First and foremost, we shall save the Territories from the five-headed Barbarism of Slavery, keeping them in their normal condition, as they came from the hand of God, free, — with Freedom written on the soil and engraved on the rock, while the winds whisper it in the trees, the rivers murmur it in their flow, and all Nature echoes it in joy unspeakable.

Next, we shall save the country and the age from that crying infamy, the Slave-Trade, whose opening anew, as now menaced, is but a logical consequence of the new theories of Slavery. If Slavery be the "blessing" it is vaunted, then must the Slave-Trade be beneficent, while they who ply it with fiercest activity take place among the missionaries and saints of humanity.

Next, we shall save the Constitution, at least within the sphere of Executive influence, from outrage and

perversion; so that the President will no longer lend himself to that wildest pretension of the Slave Oligarchy, as Mr. Buchanan has done, declaring that Slavery is carried under the Constitution into all the Territories, and that it now exists in Kansas as firmly as in South Carolina. As out of nothing can come nothing, so out of the nothing in the Constitution on this subject can be derived no support for this inordinate pretension, which may be best dismissed in that classical similitude by which the ancients rebuked a groundless folly, when they called it *ass's wool*, or something that does not exist, and plainly said to its author, *Asini lanas quæris*, — "You are in quest of ass's wool!" [1]

Next, we shall help save the Declaration of Independence, now dishonored and disowned in its essential, life-giving truth, — *the Equality of Men*. This transcendent principle, which appears twice at the Creation, first, when God said, "Let us make man in our image," and, secondly, in the Unity of the Race, then divinely established, — which appears again in the New Testament, when it was said, "God, that made the world and all things therein, hath made of one blood all nations of men," — which appears again in the primal reason of the world, anterior to all institutions and laws, — belongs to those self-evident truths, sometimes called axioms, which no man can question without exposing to question his own intelligence or honesty. As well deny arithmetically that two and two make four, or deny geometrically that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, as deny the axiomatic, self-evident, beaming truth, that all men are equal. As of the sun in the heavens, blind is he who cannot

[1] Erasmus, Adagia, Chil. I. Centur. IV. Prov. 79.

perceive it. Of course, this principle, uttered in a Declaration of Rights, is applicable simply to rights; and it is a childish sophism to allege against it the obvious inequalities of form, character, and faculties. As axiom, it admits no exception; for it is the essence of an axiom, whether in geometry or in morals, to be universal. As abstract truth, it is also without exception, according to the essence of such truth. And, finally, as self-evident truth, so announced in the Declaration, it is without exception; for only such truth can be self-evident. Thus, whether axiom, abstract truth, or self-evident truth, it is always universal. In vindicating this principle, the Republican party have a grateful duty, to which they are moved by justice to a much-injured race, excluded from its protection, and by justice also to the Fathers, whose well-chosen words, fit foundation for empire, are turned into mockery. Nor can the madness of the Propagandists be better illustrated than in this assault on the Declaration of Independence, stultifying the Fathers for no other purpose than to clear the way for their five-headed abomination of *Compulsory Labor without Wages.*

And, finally, we shall help expel the Slave Oligarchy from all its seats of National power, driving it back within the States. This alone is worthy of every effort; for, until this is done, nothing else can be completely done. In vain you seek economy or purity in the National Government, in vain you seek improvement of rivers and harbors, in vain you seek homesteads on the public lands for actual settlers, in vain you seek reform in administration, in vain you seek dignity and peace in our foreign relations, with just sympathy for struggling Freedom everywhere, while

this selfish and corrupt power holds the National purse and the National sword. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the door will be open to all generous principles. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the wickedness of the Fugitive Slave Bill will be expelled from the statute-book. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and Slavery will cease at once in the National Capital. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the Slave-Trade will no longer skulk along our coasts beneath the National flag. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and Liberty will become, in fact, as in law, the normal condition of all the National Territories. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the National Government will be at length divorced from Slavery. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the National star will be changed from Slavery to Freedom. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the North will be no longer the vassal of the South. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the North will be admitted to its just share in the trusts and honors of the Republic. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and a mighty victory of Peace will be won, whose influence on the Future of our country and of mankind no imagination can paint.

Prostrated, exposed, and permanently expelled from ill-gotten power, the Oligarchy will cease to exist as a political combination. Its final doom may be postponed, but it is certain. Languishing, it may live yet longer; but it will surely die. Yes, fellow-citizens, surely it will die, when, disappointed in purpose, driven back within the States, and constrained within these limits, it can no longer rule the Republic as a plantation of slaves at home, can no longer menace the Territories with five-headed device to compel *Labor without Wages*, can no longer fasten upon the Constitution an

interpretation which makes merchandise of men and gives disgraceful immunity to brokers of human souls and butchers of human hearts, and can no longer grind flesh and blood, with groans and sighs, tears of mothers and cries of children, into the cement of a barbarous political power. Surely, then, in its retreat, smarting under the indignation of an aroused people and the concurring judgment of the civilized world, it must die, — it may be as a poisoned rat dies of rage in its hole.

Meanwhile all good omens are ours. The work cannot stop. Quickened by the triumph now so near, with a Republican President in power, State after State, quitting the condition of a Territory and spurning Slavery, will be welcomed into our Plural Unit, and, joining hands together, will become a belt of fire girt about the Slave States, within which Slavery must die, — or, happier still, joining hands together, they will become to the Slave States a zone of Freedom, radiant, like the ancient cestus of Beauty, with transforming power.

It only remains that we speed these good influences. Others may dwell on the Past as secure; but to my mind, under the laws of a beneficent God, *the Future also is secure*, — on the single condition that we press forward in the work with heart and soul, forgetting self, turning from all temptations of the hour, and, intent only on the cause,

> "With mean complacence ne'er betray our trust,
> Nor be so civil as to prove unjust." [1]

[1] Pope, Essay on Criticism, 580, 581.

OUR CANDIDATES WILL BE ELECTED.

LETTER TO THE LINCOLN AND HAMLIN CLUB OF OWEGO, NEW YORK, JULY 30, 1860.

BOSTON, July 30, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — It is still uncertain whether my engagements here and elsewhere will allow me to visit Tioga County during the present season. But I beg to assure the Republicans there of my sympathy in their generous labors.

There is ample reward simply in working for a good cause; but we have before us, also, the assurance that our candidates will be elected.

Accept my thanks for the honor of your invitation, and believe me, dear Sir,

With much respect,
Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

ISAAC S. CATLIN, Esq.

EMANCIPATION IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIES A BLESSING, AND NOT A FAILURE.

LETTER TO A PUBLIC MEETING AT FRAMINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS, JULY 30, 1860.

BOSTON, July 30, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — If I forego the opportunity which you offer me of uniting with the earnest Abolitionists of Massachusetts in celebrating the anniversary of Emancipation in the British Islands of the West Indies, I pray you not to believe me insensible to the magnanimous teachings of that day, — destined, I doubt not, as men advance in virtue, to take its place yet more and more among the great days of History.

Nothing shows the desperate mendacity of the partisans of Slavery more than the unfounded persistence with which they call this act "a failure." If it be a failure, then is virtue a failure, then is justice a failure, then is humanity a failure, then is God himself a failure; for virtue, justice, humanity, and God himself are all represented in this act.

Well-proved facts vindicate completely the policy of Emancipation, even if it were not commanded by the simplest rules of morality. All testimony, whether from official documents or from travellers, shows, beyond question, that in these islands the condition of the negro is improved by emancipation; but this testimony

is especially instructive, when we learn that the improvement is most strongly manifest in those who have been born in Freedom. Ask any person familiar with these islands, — as I have often done, — or consult any unprejudiced authority, and such will be the answer. This alone is enough to vindicate the act. Moreover, it is enough, if *men* are raised in the scale of being, even though sugar perishes from the earth.

But careful statistics attest that the material interests of these possessions share the improvement of the population. In some of the islands, as in Barbadoes and Antigua, the advance is conspicuous, while in Jamaica itself, which is the instance most constantly cited of "failure," the evidence is unanswerable, that the derangement of affairs cannot be charged upon Emancipation, but is a natural incident to the anomalous condition of that island throughout its history, aggravated by insane pretensions of the Slave-Masters. Two different Governors of this island[1] have assured me, that, with all their experience there, they looked upon Emancipation as a "blessing." Thus is it shown that the true policy of this world is found in justice. Nothing is truer than that injustice, beside its essential wickedness, is folly also. The unjust man is a fool.

Only recently important testimony on this subject has found place, where it would be hardly expected, in the columns of the "New York Times"; and similar testimony occurs in other quarters, both in England and America. And yet, with the truth flashing in their faces, our Slave-Masters misrepresent the sublime and beautiful act as a "failure"! This, however, is of a piece with their whole conduct.

[1] The Earl of Elgin and Sir Charles Grey.

Let me thank you for the invitation with which you have honored me, and for the good wishes with which you cheer me; and believe me, my dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

SLAVERY A BARBAROUS DISEASE TO BE STAYED.

LETTER TO A REPUBLICAN MEETING AT THE DEDICATION OF THE REPUBLICAN WIGWAM IN NEW YORK, AUGUST 6, 1860.

BOSTON, August 6, 1860.

GENTLEMEN, — Accept my thanks for the invitation with which you have honored me. Knowing by recent experience something of the generous Republicans of New York, it is with reluctance that I renounce the opportunity you give me of mingling with them on an interesting occasion.

As citizens of a great metropolis, they have duties of peculiar difficulty. It is in these centres that the Pro-slavery sentiment of the North shows itself with violence often kindred to that of the plantation, so as almost to justify the language of Jefferson, who called great cities "sores" of the body politic.[1] Even this expression does not seem too strong, when we recognize the infection of Slavery breaking out sometimes in the violence of mobs, and constantly manifest in the press, in public speech, and in a corrupt public sentiment. It belongs to the Republican party, by gentle, healing influences, guided by a firm hand, to inaugurate the

[1] "The mobs of great cities add just so much to the support of pure government as sores do to the strength of the human body." — *Notes on Virginia*, Query XIX.: Writings, Vol. VIII. p. 406.

work of *cure*, that health may be substituted for disease.

Meanwhile the wretched disease must be understood, and I venture to call attention to a work just published in New York, where it is exposed with consummate ability: I refer to "Slavery in History," by Adam Gurowski. The learned author, who vindicates his new title as American citizen by noble effort for the good of his adopted country, exhibits Slavery, from the beginning of time, in all nations and places, as nothing more nor less than a monstrosity, disturbing, corrupting, and debasing the government under which it exists, and all the individuals who are parties to it, directly or indirectly: for no man can sustain Slavery, or in any way apologize for it, without suffering in moral, if not also in intellectual nature. Such a work, founded on careful studies, and executed in the spirit of science, will naturally take a place in libraries; but I am sure that all inquirers into the character of Slavery, and especially all practical Republicans, engaged in efforts to stay the spread of this barbarous disease, ought to welcome it as an ally. No good citizen who makes himself acquainted with Slavery can hesitate to join against it.

Accept my best wishes for the success of your festival, and also the assurance of the respect with which

I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,
Your obliged Servant,

CHARLES SUMNER.

HOMER FRANKLIN, ABRAHAM W. KENNEDY, W. K. SCHENCK, Esqrs.

TRIBUTE TO A COLLEGE CLASSMATE.

REMARKS ON THE LATE JOHN W. BROWNE, AUGUST 20, 1860.

MR. BROWNE died suddenly, May 1st, 1860. A little volume was printed in the summer, entitled "In Memoriam J. W. B.," to which Mr. Sumner contributed the following notice. Prefixed were the words of Fénelon: —

"Il n'y a que les grands cœurs qui sachent combien il y a de gloire à être bon."

I SHOULD feel unhappy, if this little book of tribute to my early friend were allowed to appear without a word from me. We were classmates in college, and for two out of the four years of undergraduate life were chums. We were also together in the Law School. Perhaps no person now alive knew him better, during all this period. Separated afterwards by the occupations of the world, I saw him only at intervals, though our friendship continued unbroken to the end, and when we met, it was always with the warmth and confidence of our youthful relations.

Of all my classmates, I think that he gave, in college, the largest promise of future eminence, mingled, however, with uncertainty whether the waywardness of genius might not betray him. None then imagined that the fiery nature, nursed upon the study of Byron, and delighting always to talk of his poetry and life, would be tamed to the modest ways which he afterwards adopted. The danger seemed to be, that, like his

prototype, he would break loose from social life, and follow the bent of lawless ambition, or at least plunge with passion into the strifes of the world. His earnestness at this time bordered on violence, and in all his opinions he was a partisan. But he was already thinker as well as reader, and expressed himself with accuracy and sententious force. Voice harmonizes with character, and his was too apt to be ungentle and loud.

They who have known him only latterly will be surprised at this glimpse of him in early life. A change so complete in sentiment, manner, and voice, as took place in him, I have never known. It seemed like one of those instances in Christian story, where the man of violence is softened suddenly into a saintly character. I do not exaggerate in the least. So much have I been impressed by it at times, that I could hardly believe in his personal identity, and I have recalled the good Fra Cristoforo, in the exquisite romance of Manzoni, to prove that the simplest life of unostentatious goodness may succeed a youth hot with passion of all kinds.

To me, who knew him so well in his other moods, it was touching in the extreme to note this change. Listening to his voice, now so gentle and low, while he conversed on the duties of life, and with perfect simplicity revealed his own abnegation of worldly aims, I have been filled with reverence. At these times his conversation was peculiar and instructive. He had thought for himself, and expressed what he said with all his native force refined by new-born sweetness of soul, which would have commended sentiments even of less intrinsic interest. I saw how, in the purity of his nature, he turned aside from riches and from ambition of all kinds, content with a tranquil existence,

undisturbed by any of those temptations which promised once to exercise such sway over him. But his opinions, while uttered with modesty, were marked by the hardihood of an original thinker, showing that in him

> "the Gods had joined
> The mildest manners and the bravest mind."

His firm renunciation of office, opening the way to a tempting political career, when formally tendered to him, is almost unique. He had been Representative from Lynn, in the Legislature of Massachusetts, and was nominated as Senator for Essex. This was long ago, in 1838, while he was yet a young man; and here his sagacity seemed to be remarkable as his principles. At that early day, when the two old political parties had been little criticised, he announced that their strife was "occasional and temporary, and that both had forgotten or overlooked the great principle of equal liberty for all, upon which a free government must rest as its only true and safe basis." He then proceeded to dissolve his connection with parties, in words worthy of perpetual memory. "I disconnect myself from party," he said, "whose iron grasp holds hard even upon the least of us, and mean in my little sphere, as a private individual, to serve what seems to me the cause of the country and humanity. I cannot place currency above liberty. I cannot place money above man. I cannot fight heartily for the Whigs and against their opponents, when I feel, that, whichever shall be the victorious party, the claims of humanity will be forgotten in the triumph, and that the rights of the slave may be crushed beneath the advancing hosts of the victors."[1]

[1] Letter to the Whig County Committee of the County of Essex, November 5, 1838: In Memoriam J. W. B., pp. 9, 10.

No better words have been uttered in our political history. In this spirit, and with his unquestionable abilities, he might well have acted an important part in the growing conflict with Slavery. But his love of retreat grew also, and he shrank completely from all the activities of political life. There was nothing that was not within his reach; but he could not be tempted.

I cannot disguise that at times I was disposed to criticise this withdrawal, as suggesting too closely the questionable philosophy concentrated in the saying, *Bene vixit qui bene latuit.* But as often as I came within the sphere of his influence, and felt the simple beauty of his life, while I saw how his soul, like the sensitive leaf, closed at the touch of the world, I was willing to believe that he had chosen wisely for himself, or at all events that his course was founded on a system deliberately adopted, upon which even an old friend must not intrude. Having always the greatest confidence in his resources, intellectual as well as moral, I was never without hope that in some way he would make his mark upon his country and his age. If he has not done this, he has at least left an example precious to all who knew him.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND THE ISSUES.

SPEECH AT THE STATE CONVENTION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AT WORCESTER, AUGUST 29, 1860.

THIS Convention was organized by the choice of the following officers : —

President, — George S. Boutwell of Groton.

Vice-Presidents, — At large, — Alfred Macy of Nantucket, Robert T. Davis of Fall River, Ezra W. Taft of Dedham, George Morey of Boston, Samuel Hooper of Boston, Charles W. Upham of Salem, P. J. Stone of Charlestown, B. C. Sargent of Lowell, Ebenezer Torrey of Fitchburg, Joel Hayden of Williamsburg, W. B. C. Pearsons of Holyoke; Suffolk, — Charles Torrey of Boston ; Essex,— Henry K. Oliver of Lawrence ; Middlesex, — Charles Hudson of Lexington ; Worcester, — P. Emory Aldrich of Worcester ; Norfolk, — James Ritchie of Roxbury ; Bristol, — Samuel O. Dunbar of Taunton ; Hampden, — E. B. Gillette of Westfield ; Hampshire, — William Hyde of Ware ; Franklin, — William B. Washburn of Greenfield ; Berkshire, — Walter Laflin of Pittsfield ; Plymouth, — Levi Reed of Abington ; Barnstable, — James Gifford of Provincetown ; Nantucket, — Edward Field of Nantucket ; Dukes, — John Vinson of Edgartown.

Secretaries, — George W. McLellan of Cambridge, Andrew Tower of Malden, Philip Cook of Provincetown, A. B. Underwood of Newton, W. C. Sheldon of Ware, W. W. Clapp, Jr., of Boston, Charles H. Spring of Holyoke, Franklin Williams of Roxbury, J. J. Piper of Fitchburg, Edmund Anthony of New Bedford, Thomas G. Kent of Milford, Edwin B. George of Groveland, W. S. George of Adams, J. A. Alden of East Bridgewater, S. S. Eastman of Greenfield, W. A. Brabiner of Brighton.

At this Convention John A. Andrew was for the first time nominated as Governor.

The Convention had more than its annual importance, as it was on the eve of a Presidential election. Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, were the Republican candidates for Presi-

dent and Vice-President; John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and Joseph Lane, of Oregon, the Democratic candidates; Stephen H. Douglas, of Illinois, and Herschell V. Johnson, of Georgia, the candidates of a seceding body of Democrats, known as the Douglas party; John Bell, of Tennessee, and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, candidates of old Whigs, called at the time the Bell-Everett party.

On motion of J. D. Baldwin, of Worcester, afterwards Representative in Congress, Mr. Sumner was invited to address the Convention. The report says: —

"Mr. Sumner then came forward, and his appearance upon the platform was hailed with enthusiastic shouts, which testified the esteem and admiration in which the distinguished Senator is held by his fellow-Republicans of the Commonwealth. The cheering was continued some minutes, and when it had subsided, Mr. Sumner proceeded to address the crowded assembly, — the vast hall being filled to overflowing."

MR. PRESIDENT, — It is now six years since I had the honor of meeting my Republican fellow-citizens of Massachusetts in State Convention, drawn together from all parts of our beloved Commonwealth, — and then also, I remember well, it was at this good city of Worcester. Returning, at last, with restored health, to the activities of public life, I am happy again in this opportunity. It is pleasant to look into the faces of friends, and to feel the sympathy of kindred hearts.

Nor can I disguise the satisfaction which I find at being here in Worcester, — early and constant home of the Republican cause. When other places, even in Massachusetts, were indifferent for Freedom, Worcester was earnest; and when the cause was defeated in other counties, here, under the lead of an eminent citizen, now the ornament of the bench,[1] it triumphed by brilliant majorities; so that Worcester became known, not only throughout Massachusetts, but everywhere, through-

[1] Hon. Charles Allen.

out the country, as our impregnable stronghold. Long since, while America was yet an unsettled wilderness, an English poet depicted a county of our motherland as

"That shire which we *the heart of England* well may call";[1]

and this ancient verse furnishes a descriptive phrase which has been aptly applied to our Worcester, "the heart," as it is the central county, of the Commonwealth. But though truly belonging to Worcester on this account, I have always been glad to believe that it only justly depicted her as the "heart" of our cause, — here at least in Massachusetts.

If this cause were of common political interest, if it turned only on some question of mere policy, or if it involved simply the honors and emoluments of office, I should willingly leave the contest to others. It would have little attraction for me But it is far above these things. It concerns the permanent well-being, primarily, of all the outlying territories of the Republic, broad enough for empires, now menaced by Slavery; and since one part of the body cannot suffer without all being affected, it concerns the permanent well-being and also the good name of the whole country, clouded by the growing influence of Slavery. Nor is this all. The special motive for the proposed extension of Slavery is to fortify the Slave Power in the Senate of the United States, and, through the assured preponderance of this Power there, to control the National Government in legislation, diplomacy, and the distribution of office, so that, in short, no law can be passed, no treaty

[1] Drayton, Poly-Olbion, Song XIII. Warwickshire, the middle county of England, is the shire referred to.

can be ratified, and no individual, though possessing all possible fitness for public service, can be confirmed for office of any kind, without the consent of the Slave Power, — thus, through the Senate, controlling the Judiciary itself. Seeking, therefore, by active measures, — I say active and immediate measures, — to save the Territories, you seek also to save the whole country, not only from a deadly influence, but also from a degrading rule, which ostracizes from office all who avow the early opinions of the Fathers.

Such is our cause, nakedly stated, without illustration or argument. Strange that it is not recognized at once by every patriot heart! Strange that we should be compelled to vindicate it, sometimes against open foes, and sometimes — harder still — against others who betray it with a kiss!

In the coming election this cause has its representative in Abraham Lincoln. And why has he been selected? Not solely because he is a popular favorite in the great Northwest, — of blameless life, of unimpeachable integrity, of acknowledged abilities, and of practical talent, all of which are unquestionable recommendations, shared, however, by many others, — but because he had made himself the determined champion of the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, stating the case with knowledge, with moderation, and yet with firmness, — avowing openly his hatred of Slavery, — likening its introduction in the Territories now to the Canada thistle, which a few may plant to the detriment of succeeding generations, and then again to snakes deposited in the cradle of an infant, — and especially exposing the dishonest invention of "Squatter Sov-

ereignty," which would despoil Congress of all power over this subject, and transfer it to the distant handful of first settlers.

On two different occasions his views have been put forth and developed, — first, in elaborate controversy with Mr. Douglas in Illinois, and, secondly, in his well-known speech at the Cooper Institute, New York. He does not need my praise; nor would I step aside from my argument to praise anybody; but I may fitly call attention to this masterly address, which, in careful research, clearness of statement, and directness of purpose, may well compare with any one of the innumerable speeches ever made concerning the power of Congress over the Territories. On the topic it professes to treat it is a monograph. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the effort was needed in establishing his title to that public confidence which made him our candidate. It is for the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories that he has labored, and, excepting his brief, but honorable, experience in Congress, his public life may be summed up in this single service, — nor more nor less. The magnitude of the service may be measured by his present position as representative of our cause.

Arrayed in opposition are three other candidates for the Presidency, — Bell, Breckinridge, and Douglas, — I mention them in alphabetical order, — differing superficially among themselves, but all concurring in friendship for Slavery and in withstanding its prohibition anywhere, with followers ready, in warfare against the Republican party, to coalesce or fuse with each other. In this readiness you see the common antagonism. No Republican party can think of coalition

or fusion with either of these three parties; for they each and all represent in some form resistance to the Prohibition of Slavery, and therefore must be opposed, each and all. The whole trio are no better than Mrs. Malaprop's idea of Cerberus, "three gentlemen at once," and must be encountered together.

Looking at them separately, there is, first, the Bell party. Pardon me, if I use names familiarly: it is but for the sake of convenience. This party, known among us only by its boasts, draws its practical support from the Slave States. It is a Proslavery party, — essentially hostile to the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, and dealing always in treacherous generalities, which, if they have any meaning, mean Slavery, — exalting the Constitution, as Slave-Masters understand it, — also exalting the Union, in order to gain credit for "saving" it, — and calling for the enforcement of the laws, meaning the enforcement of the only Act of Congress which Slave-Masters specially recognize, that for the surrender of fugitive slaves. Your indulgence would hardly excuse me, if I occupied time in argument against this combination, which, without declaring a single principle, without any chance of a majority in the electoral colleges, and without any hope of a single electoral vote in the Free States, runs for luck, — which, with only a single possible vote in the House of Representatives, where it seeks, for a revolutionary purpose, to transfer the election, again proposes to run for luck.

Its plan, so far as known, is this. You will remember, that, by the Constitution of the United States, in the event of failure to elect by the people, the House

of Representatives is empowered to choose a President out of the three highest candidates for that office, and the Senate to choose a Vice-President out of the two highest candidates for that office. Now, assuming, first, that the Republican candidate will not be elected by the people, which you know to be a very wild assumption, — and, secondly, assuming that there will be no election of President by the House, — this party, turning next to the Vice-Presidency, assumes, thirdly, that Mr. Everett will be one of the two highest candidates for the Vice-Presidency, and, fourthly, that Mr. Everett will be elected by the Senate Vice-President, and then will become President, like John Tyler and Millard Fillmore, — not through the death of a President, but through a double failure by the people and by the House. Such is the calculation by which this band of professed Conservatives seek repose for the country. Permit me to say that it is equalled only by the extravagance of Mrs. Toodles, in the farce. Her passion was auctions, where she purchased ancient articles of furniture under the idea that they might some day be useful. Once, to the amazement of her husband, she brought home a brass door-plate with the name of Thompson spelled with a p. "But what is this for?" he demanded. "Why," said Mrs. Toodles, with logic worthy of the Bell party, "though we have been married many years without children, it is possible, my dear, that we may have a child, that child may be a daughter, and may live to the age of maturity, and she *may* marry a man of the name of Thompson spelled with a p. Then how handy it will be to have this door-plate in the house!" I doubt if any person really familiar with affairs can consider this nomination for

the Vice-Presidency of more practical value than Mrs. Toodles's brass door-plate, with the name of Thompson spelled with a p, picked up at an auction. But then, in a certain most difficult contingency at the end of a long line of contingencies, how handy it must be to have it in the house!

In speaking of the Breckinridge party, I confess myself at the outset perplexed between abhorrence of its dogma and respect for its frankness. No plausible generality is put forward, as by the Bell party, under which good and evil may alike find shelter; nor is any plausible invention announced, as in the case of yet another party, under which the real issue is avoided. But the insufferable claim, first made by Mr. Calhoun, is unequivocally promulgated, that under the Constitution the master may at all times carry his slaves into the Territories, and neither Congress nor Territorial Legislature can prohibit the outrage. This at least is plain. There is something even in criminal boldness which we are disposed to admire. We like an open foe, who scorns to hide in deceit, and meets us in daylight. But we do not like a foe who dodges and hides so that we cannot find him. Nor do we like a man who gives us only something counterfeit in exchange for our votes. We do not like the double-faced prevaricator, who cozens both sides, and deals in words "that palter in a double sense." It is praise to be frank, even on a bad side; and I have no reason to question this merit of the Breckinridge party. And yet this very frankness reveals an insensibility to reason and humanity, which, when recognized, must add to our abhorrence. That men calling themselves Christians,

calling themselves Americans, in this nineteenth century, should without a blush assert such a dogma may well excite our wonder.

Fully to appreciate this dogma, you must know and feel what Slavery is. And here I content myself simply with reminding you of what elsewhere I have demonstrated, that Slavery, as defined by existing law, is a *five-headed* Barbarism, composed of five different wrongs, each of which you must indignantly reject: first, the impudent claim of property in man; secondly, the gross mockery of the marriage-tie; thirdly, the absolute nullification of the parental relation; fourthly, the denial of instruction; and, fifthly, the robbery of another's labor, and of all its fruits: that this whole five-headed Barbarism, sustained by existing law, and enforced by the lash, is simply *to compel labor without wages;* and that to this end all great rights of freedom, marriage, family, instruction, and property are trampled down. This is Slavery. Turn it over, look at it as you will, such it is, and such it must be seen to be by every honest mind.

> "To those who know thee not no words can paint,
> And those who know thee know all words are faint."

Believe me, fellow-citizens, I do not present this outline willingly. Gladly would I drop a veil over the revolting features. But when audacious claims are made for Slavery, and you are told by one candidate that it travels with the Constitution into new Territories, and then by another candidate that the handful of first settlers can alone deal with it in the Territories, while Congress sits powerless, it becomes your duty to consider precisely what Slavery is, to study it in the law from which it derives its character, and to

follow it also in all its effects. Here is the essential and vital part of the argument, even on the question of Constitutional Law. It is only when this is done that we can see how irrational is every effort to give it constitutional force, or to save it from the action of Congress within the national jurisdiction.

According to the claim now made, Slavery exists under the Constitution everywhere outside the States,— in other words, Slavery is National; whereas just the contrary is true. Everywhere outside the States Freedom must prevail; in other words, Freedom is National. Yes, Freedom is National, and Slavery Sectional. Read the Constitution, and tell me if it be not so. Surely, if a pretension so peculiar as that now set up could be found there, it would be plain to all, so that no man could question it. Like the Decalogue, it would be in positive language: "Thou shalt enslave thy brother man." It would be left to no doubtful phrase or ambiguous words, but would stand forth in appalling certainty, a "darkness visible." It would be stuck up, like Gessler's hat in the marketplace, so that all could see it. But nothing is clearer than that in this well-considered instrument there is not one clause or word which maintains property in man, not one clause or word on which any such pretension can be founded. Wherever there is any imagined reference to slaves, it is at most only to their possible existence in States, "under the laws thereof"; and then their designation as "persons" shows, that, whatever may be their condition in the States, the Constitution does not regard them as "property." Thank God, the Constitution does not contain the idea that man can be the property of man. It was the declared

purpose of Mr. Madison to exclude this idea. So completely has this been done, that it is among boasts often made, that a stranger in a distant country or a future age, reading our Constitution, and having no other record of our history, would not know that any human being had ever been claimed as "property" within the limits of the Republic. The text, at least, of the Constitution is blameless. If men find Slavery there, it is only because they make the Constitution reflect their own souls.

And yet this pretension is now the shibboleth of a great political party; this is its single inspiration; this is its only principle; this is all its stock in trade; this is its very "breath of life." To this base use has Democracy come. In voting for Mr. Breckinridge, you declare, first, that man can have property in his fellow-man, and, secondly, that such property is recognized by the Constitution of the United States. The soul recoils from both. But even if the first be true, — which I utterly deny, — it does not follow that such property is sanctioned in the Constitution.

Last in order of alphabet is the Douglas party, whose single cry is "Popular Sovereignty"; last also in character, — for who can respect what we know to be a deceit? The statesman founds himself on principles; sometimes it is his office to frame expedients; but Popular Sovereignty, as now put forward, is not a principle, — oh, no! not even an expedient; it is nothing but a device, a pretext, an evasion, a dodge, a trick, in order to avoid the commanding question, whether Slavery shall be prohibited in the Territories. That is all.

All hail to Popular Sovereignty in its true glory! This is the grand principle, first announced in the Declaration of Independence, which is destined to regenerate the world. It is embodied in those famous words, adopted by the Republican Convention at Chicago, that among the unalienable rights of all men are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*" These are sacred words, full of life-giving energy. Not simply national independence was here proclaimed, but also the primal rights of all mankind. Then and there appeared the Angel of Human Liberation, speaking and acting at once with heaven-born strength, — breaking bolts, unloosing bonds, and opening prison-doors, — always ranging on its mighty errand, wherever there are any, no matter of what country or race, who struggle for rights denied, — now cheering Garibaldi at Naples, as it had cheered Washington in the snows of Valley Forge, — and especially visiting all who are down-trodden, whispering that there is none so poor as to be without rights which every man is bound to respect.

> "The affrighted gods confessed their awful lord;
> *They dropped the fetters*, trembled, and adored." [1]

None so degraded as to be beneath its beneficent reach, none so lofty as to be above its restraining power; while before it Despotism and Oligarchy fall on their faces, like the image of Dagon, and the people everywhere begin to govern themselves. Such is the Popular Sovereignty proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence.

[1] Iliad, tr. Pope, Book I. 528, 529 [406].

But the Great Declaration, not content with announcing certain rights as unalienable, and therefore beyond the control of any government, still further, restrains the sovereignty, which it asserts, by simply declaring that the United States have "full power to do all acts and things which independent states may OF RIGHT do." Here is a well-defined limitation upon Popular Sovereignty. The dogma of Tory lawyers and pamphleteers — put forward to sustain the claim of Parliamentary omnipotence, and vehemently espoused by Dr. Johnson in his "Taxation no Tyranny" — was, openly, that *sovereignty* is in its nature *illimitable*, precisely as is now loosely professed by Mr. Douglas for his handful of squatters. But this dogma is distinctly discarded in the Declaration, and it is frankly proclaimed that all *sovereignty* is subordinate to the rule of *Right*. Mark, now, the difference. All existing governments at that time, even the local governments of the Colonies, stood on *Power*, without limitation. Here was a new government, which, taking its place among the nations, announced that it stood only on *Right*, and claimed no sovereignty inconsistent with *Right*. Such, again, is the Popular Sovereignty of the Declaration of Independence.

And yet this transcendent principle is now degraded into a "dodge," and the sacred name of Popular Sovereignty is prostituted to cover the claim of a master over his slave. It is urged that a handful of squatters may rightfully decide this claim, and the time-honored traditional power of Congress over Slavery in the Territories is denied or voted down. To protect this "villany," as John Wesley would call it, the right of the people to govern themselves is invoked, — forgetful that

this 'divine right can give no authority to enslave others, that even the people are not omnipotent, and that never do they rise so high as when, recognizing the everlasting laws of Right, they bend to the behests of Justice.

Though bearing the name of Mr. Douglas, and now peddled through the country by him, this contrivance is not of his invention. It comes from an older head. It first showed itself in the Nicholson Letter of 1847, by which General Cass, as Presidential candidate, sought to avoid the Wilmot Proviso. Laborious, studious, exemplary in private life, and fertile in pretexts, this venerable character has afforded the formula by which men have voted for Slavery, while making professions for Freedom. He is author of the artifice — rejected by every Slave-Master, and rejected by every lover of Freedom, whose eyes are open — which, under the nickname of Squatter Sovereignty, has been the device of doughfaces, enabling them sometimes to deceive the public and sometimes even to deceive themselves. Owing to the peculiar condition of opinion at that time, not yet stiffened against the compromise of Human Rights, his very vacillation put him in harmony with the public, and gave him a commanding position. Once for the Wilmot Proviso, which asserted the power of Congress over the Territories, and then for a pretended Popular Sovereignty, which denied this power, he became the pendulum between Freedom and Slavery, and, thus swinging, imparted motion to a sham Democracy.

The device next showed itself on the passage of the Kansas and Nebraska Bill; and here it became a trick, as appears by open confession of one of the parties

to it, — and a trick it has continued ever since. It was proposed to repeal the old Prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory, established as part of the Missouri Compromise. But instead of doing this openly and precisely, by simple words of repeal, language was invented to mystify the whole question. Then appeared that "little stump speech injected in the belly of the bill," according to Colonel Benton, declaring that the intent was to leave the people "perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." As in the gray of the morning the fatal bill containing these words passed, General Cass, rising from his seat, — I remember well the scene, — exclaimed, "This is the triumph of Squatter Sovereignty!" The old Prohibition of Slavery was overthrown, and his Nicholson Letter was vindicated.

And now note well the trick. The Slave-Masters who voted for these words rejected with scorn the idea that the handful of squatters could exclude Slavery. According to them, Slavery went with the Constitution, and was beyond the control of squatters. But formal assertion of this dogma would have caused trouble, and it was accordingly disguised in these familiar words, — "subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, in a recent speech, lets us behind the scenes. He tells, that, at a caucus of Senators, "both wings of the Democracy agreed that each should maintain its particular theory before the public, — one side sustaining Squatter Sovereignty, and the other Protection to Slavery in the Territories, but pledging themselves to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court, whatever it might be." Such was

the secret conspiracy, concealed for a long time from the public, and only recently revealed. And Mr. Douglas was a party to it.

Had the Popular Sovereignty of Mr. Douglas been a reality and not a sham, had it been a sincere recognition of popular rights instead of a trick to avoid their recognition, he could not have been party to such deception. But how was the fact? While professing Popular Sovereignty, what did his bill really confer upon the people? Not the right to organize their own government, determining for themselves its form and character; for all this was done by Act of Congress. Not the right to choose the Executive; for the Governor and all other officers in this department were sent from Washington, nominated by the President. Not the right to nominate the Judiciary; for the judges were also sent from Washington, nominated by the President. Not even the right completely to constitute the Legislature; for even this body was placed in many important respects beyond the popular control. Thus in each of the three great departments of State, Executive, Judicial, and Legislative, is Popular Sovereignty disowned.

Search the "Congressional Globe" during the Nebraska debate, and you will see with what sincerity Mr. Douglas guarded the much vaunted rights of the people. Mr. Chase moved to allow the people to elect their Governor and other officers. On the vote by ayes and noes, the champion of Popular Sovereignty voted *No.* Mr. Chase, whose effort to unmask this hypocrisy was indefatigable, made another motion, which put Mr. Douglas still more to the test. After the words of alleged Popular Sovereignty in the bill, he moved to add,

"under which the people of the Territory, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of Slavery therein." Here was a plain proposition. On the vote by ayes and noes, Mr. Douglas and his associates again voted *No.* His recent excuse, put forth in his single peripatetic speech, is, that the proposition was not in the alternate, — that is, that it gave power only to exclude, and not to admit. But if he really favored it in that form, why not move to amend it by adding the power to admit, instead of voting against the whole proposition? It is clear that such an open and unequivocal declaration was not congenial with the game to be played.

The bill passed, and then came other opportunities to test the sincerity of the present knight-errant of Popular Sovereignty. Under its provisions commenced at once a race of emigration into the new Territories, and there Free Labor and Slave Labor grappled. Lovers of Freedom from the North were encountered by partisans of Slavery from the South, organized by Blue Lodges in Missouri, and incited from every part of the Land of Slavery. The officials of a government established under pretended safeguards of Popular Sovereignty all ranged themselves on the side of Slavery; or, if their allegiance became doubtful, — as in the case of Governor Reeder, — they were dismissed, and more available tools sent instead. I spare details. You cannot forget that winter and spring preceding the Presidential election of 1856, when we were alternately startled and stunned at tidings from Kansas, as a body of strangers from Missouri, entering in hundreds, forcibly seized the polls, and, under pretended forms of law, set up a Usurpation, which by positive legislation pro-

ceeded to establish Slavery there, and to surround it with a Code of Death. The atrocity of Philip the Second, when, by violence and through a "Council of Blood," he sought to fasten the Inquisition upon Holland, was renewed. Invasion, rapine, outrage, arson, rape, murder, the scalping-knife, were the agents now employed; and to crown this prostration of popular rights, Lawrence, home of New England settlers, and microcosm of New England life, was burned to the ground by a company of profane and drunken ruffians stimulated from Washington.

What then was the course of the champion of Popular Sovereignty? Did he thunder and lighten? Did he come forward to defend those settlers, who had gone to Kansas under pretended safeguards of his bill? Oh, no! In the Senate he openly ranged himself on the side of their oppressors, mocked at their calamities, denounced them as "insurgents," insulted their agents, and told them they must submit, — while the distant Emigrant Aid Society in Massachusetts was made the butt of his most opprobrious assaults. All this I myself witnessed.

Then came another scene, with which, owing to my enforced absence from the Senate, as an invalid, I have less personal familiarity; but it is known to all of you. The Senatorial election in Illinois was at hand, when Mr. Douglas suddenly discovered that Popular Sovereignty was something more than a name. He opposed the Lecompton Constitution; but my distinguished colleague [Mr. WILSON] will tell you that even there he was kept from barefaced apostasy only by the stern will and indomitable principle of the lamented Broderick, the murdered Senator from California.

Then came stump speeches and Senate speeches without number, and a magazine article, all to explain Popular Sovereignty. But this simple principle, which, in the light of the Declaration of Independence, and also in the light of reason, is plain enough, has been so twisted, turned, and befogged, now explained away and then explained back, now enlarged and then limited, now acknowledged and then denied, that I challenge any person to say with certainty in what, according to Mr. Douglas, it really consists.

At one time we find him declaring that "Slavery is the creature of local law, and not of the Constitution of the United States." Good! Let him follow this to its natural conclusion, and no Republican asks more.

Then, at New Orleans, after his election to the Senate was secured, he says: "The Democracy of Illinois accept the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott as an authoritative interpretation of the Constitution. In accordance with that decision, we hold that slaves are property, and hence on an equality with all other kinds of property, and that the owner of a slave has the same right to move into a Territory and carry his slave property with him as the owner of any other property has to go there and carry his property." Here is the extreme dogma of Slavery in full feather. Let him follow this to its natural conclusion, and no Breckinridge man could ask more.

At another time we find him declaring that "sovereign States have the right to make their own constitutions and establish their own governments, but that he has never claimed these powers for the Territories, nor has he ever failed to resist such claims, when set up by

others." How, then, under this theory, can Popular Sovereignty have any foothold in the Territories? It is clear that all Territorial legislation against Slavery must be invalid.

And then again, in another place, by roundabout language, he admits, that, according to the Dred Scott decision, which he declares that he "approves," the people of a Territory cannot, by any legislation, confiscate slave property, or impair the "Constitutional right" of the master to this property in the Territory. With this limitation, pray, where, again, is Popular Sovereignty?

But elsewhere, as if to furnish something for the other side, he intimates a policy of inaction by the Territorial Legislature with regard to Slavery, and asks, "Would not the *inaction* of the local Legislature, its refusal to provide a *Slave Code*, or to punish offences against that species of property, exclude Slavery just as effectually as a Constitutional prohibition?" And here is an end of the matter.

Changing forms as often as Proteus, we yet find him admitting, first, that Slavery goes into the Territories under the Constitution; secondly, that the right of property in a slave cannot be destroyed by the Territorial Legislature; and all that this Legislature can do, by way of opposition, is to fold its hands and to seal its tongue in inaction. What, then, is this wonderful doctrine? So far as it means anything, it is simply this: that the people of a Territory have a right to *introduce* Slavery, but not to *prohibit* it. And such is Popular Sovereignty! Verily, between this and the Breckinridge dogma there is about the same difference as between the much-vexed doctrines of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, where there was only

the difference of a single syllable, and both involved the same thing.

Nor is even this all. The Convention at Baltimore which nominated Mr. Douglas has declared by formal resolution, that "the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, as the same has been or shall hereafter be finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, should be respected by all good citizens, and *enforced with promptness and fidelity by every branch of the General Government.*" And Mr. Douglas, in accepting his nomination, has expressly recognized this doctrine, thus in advance delivering over his bantling Popular Sovereignty to the tender mercies of the Supreme Court.

Far different is the position of Mr. Lincoln, who has openly said, in his debate with Mr. Douglas, "If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether Slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should. That is what I would do."[1] And allow me to add, that this doctrine of Mr. Lincoln is the doctrine of the Republican party. Any doctrine short of this betrays the trick of Mr. Douglas.

The tree is known by its fruits, and if anything further were needed to expose this cheat of Popular Sovereignty, it might be found in its fruits as boasted by Mr. Douglas. A slave code most revolting in character had been adopted by the Territorial Legislature of New Mexico, not only establishing Slavery

[1] Speech at Chicago, July 10, 1858: Political Debates between Hon. Abraham Lincoln and Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, p. 20.

there, including the serfdom of whites, but prohibiting Emancipation. Through the generous activity of the Republicans, and in the exercise of a just Congressional intervention, a bill passed the House of Representatives annulling this slave code. While the bill was on the table of the Senate, attesting at once the disposition of the House of Representatives to interfere against Slavery, and also the signal necessity of such interference, Mr. Douglas took occasion to make his boasts. Surrounded by the chiefs of Proslavery Democracy, the juggler of Popular Sovereignty thus showed what the trick had done for Slavery. Here are his words: —

"It is part of the history of the country, that, under this doctrine of Non-Intervention, this doctrine that you delight to call Squatter Sovereignty, the people of New Mexico have introduced and protected Slavery in the whole of that Territory. *Under this doctrine, they have converted a tract of Free Territory into Slave Territory more than five times the size of the State of New York.* Under this doctrine, *Slavery has been extended from the Rio Grande to the Gulf of California,* and from the line of the Republic of Mexico, not only up to 36° 30′, but up to 38°, *giving you a degree and a half more Slave Territory than you ever claimed.*"[1]

As the tree is known by its fruits, so also is the man known by the company he keeps. At first associated with Mr. Douglas on the same ticket, as candidate for the Vice-Presidency, was Mr. Fitzpatrick, of Alabama, belonging to the school of Slave Propagandists, and fresh from voting in the Senate against Popular Sovereignty; and when he declined, his place was supplied

[1] Speech in the Senate, May 16, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 314.

by Mr. Johnson, of Georgia, also belonging to the school of Slave Propagandists, who from the beginning has denounced Popular Sovereignty, and insisted that "it is the right of the South to demand, and the duty of Congress to extend, protection to Slavery in the Territories during the Territorial state," and who, at Philadelphia, in a public speech, did not hesitate to insult the mechanics and working-men of the country by the insolent declaration that "Capital should own Labor." Such is the associate of Mr. Douglas, with whom he is so united as candidate that you cannot vote for one without voting for the other. One of his earnest supporters in the Convention at Baltimore, Mr. Gaulden, of Georgia, pressed the opening of the slave-trade with Africa on the very grounds of Popular Sovereignty and Non-Intervention. After declaring, that, "if it be right to go to Virginia and buy a negro and pay two thousand dollars for him, it is equally right to go to Africa, where we can get them for fifty dollars," he said, that, "if the Southern men had the spunk and spirit to come right up and face the North, he believed the Northern Democracy, at least, would come to the true doctrine of Popular Sovereignty and Non-Intervention." This barbarous utterance was received by the Douglas Convention with "applause and laughter." Such are the men with whom this candidate is associated.

If you follow Mr. Douglas in his various speeches, you cannot fail to be shocked by the heartlessness of his language. Never in history has any public man insulted human nature so boldly. At the North he announces himself as "always for the white man against the nigger," but at the South he is "for the nigger

against the alligator." It was natural that such a man, who thus mocked at a portion of God's creation made in the Divine image, should say, "Vote Slavery up or vote it down," — as if the idea of voting it up were not impious and never to be endured. Beyond all doubt, no majority can be permitted to vote that fellow-men shall be bought and sold like cattle. The pretension is preposterous, aggravated by knowledge on his part that under his device the settlers could only vote Slavery up, and that they were not allowed to vote it down. But this speech attests a brazen insensibility to Human Rights. Not so spoke the Fathers of the Republic, who would not let us miss an opportunity to vote Slavery down. Not so spoke Washington, who declared that to the abolition of Slavery "his suffrage should never be wanting." Such is the whole political philosophy of this Presidential candidate. A man thus indifferent to the rights of a whole race is naturally indifferent to other things which make for justice and peace.

Again he cries out, that the Slavery agitation is in the way of public business, and that it must be removed from Congress. But who has thrust it there so incessantly as himself? Nay, who so largely as himself has been the occasion of its appearance? His complaint illustrates anew the old fable. It was the wolf above that troubled the waters, and not the lamb below. It is the Slave Propagandists — among whom the champion of Popular Sovereignty must find a place — who, from the Missouri Compromise in 1820, through all the different stages of discussion, down to the shutting out of Kansas as a Free State at the recent session, have rendered it impossible to avoid the

exciting subject. By dishonest, audacious theories of Slavery, both morally and constitutionally, they have aroused a natural opposition, and put all who truly love their country on the defensive. Yes, it is in defence of the Constitution perverted, of reason insulted, and of humanity disowned, that we are obliged to speak out.

True, the country needs repose; — but it is the repose of Liberty, and not the repose of Despotism. And, believe me, that glad day can never come, until the mad assumptions for Slavery are all rejected, and the Government is once more brought back to the spirit of the founders. It was clearly understood at the beginning that Congress could not touch Slavery in the States; and this is the doctrine of the Republican party now. But it was also clearly understood at the beginning that Slavery everywhere else was within the jurisdiction of Congress; and this also is the doctrine of the Republican party now. With the practical acceptance of these two correlative principles the Slavery Question will cease to agitate Congress and to divide political parties. Transferred to the more tranquil domain of morals, religion, economy, and philanthropy, it must continue to occupy the attention of the good and the humane; but it will cease to be the stumbling-block of politicians. Not until then is it permitted us to expect that Sabbath of repose so much longed for.

The first stage in securing for our country the repose which all covet will be the election of Abraham Lincoln as President, and the election of that well-tried,

faithful, and able Senator, — whom I know well, — Hannibal Hamlin, as Vice-President. I do not dwell on all that will then follow, — homesteads for actual settlers, improvement of rivers and harbors, economy and purity in the National Administration, increased means of communication, postal and commercial, with the establishment of a Pacific Railroad; nor do I dwell on the extirpation of the direful African slave-trade, now thriving anew under our national flag, — nor on our relations with foreign countries, destined to assume that character of moderation and firmness which becomes a great republic, neither menacing the weak nor stooping to the proud, and, while sympathizing with generous endeavors for Freedom everywhere, avoiding all complicity with schemes of lawless violence. Ask the eminent Boston merchant, Mr. Clark, whose avocation makes him know so well the conduct of our Government with Hayti, if there is not need of change in our course toward a humble people, in order to save ourselves from the charge of national meanness, if not of national injustice? But it is by this election that you will especially vindicate the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, even in the face of the Dred Scott decision, and fling your indignant answer at once at the Proslavery non-committalism of Bell, the Proslavery dogma of Breckinridge, and the Proslavery dodge of Douglas.

All this can be done, nay, will be done. But let me not beguile you. The ancient price of Liberty was vigilance; and this price has not diminished of late years, especially when surrounded by men accustomed to power and stimulated by rage. Already the news has reached us of combinations to consolidate the Opposi-

tion, — as we read that of old two inveterate parties among the Jews were reconciled. "The same day," writes the sacred historian, "Pilate and Herod were made friends together; for before they were at enmity between themselves." This example is too kindred not to be adopted. Already, also, we hear of devices at a distance, and even near at home, to distract our friends, by producing distrust either of our principles or of our candidate. At one time it is said that the principle of Prohibition is a mistake, — and then again, by natural consequence, that our candidate is not sufficiently moderate.

Fellow-citizens, hearken not to any of these things. Keep the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories as the fixed and irreversible purpose of your hearts, and insist that it shall be established by Congress; for without Congress it may not be established. Old Cato procured a decree of the Roman Senate that no king should ever enter Rome, saying that "a king is a carnivorous animal." A similar decree must be adopted by Congress against an animal more carnivorous than king. In upholding this paramount necessity, I utter nothing new. During the debate on the Nebraska Bill, my eminent colleague at that time in the Senate, Mr. Everett, now candidate for the Vice-Presidency, while approving the Prohibition, allowed himself to disparage its importance. With the convictions which are mine, I felt it my duty to reply, kindly, but most strenuously. After exhibiting the efficacy of the Prohibition, I said:—

"Surely this cannot be treated lightly. But I am unwilling to measure the exigency of the Prohibition by the number of persons, whether many or few, whom it may

protect. Human rights, whether in a multitude or the solitary individual, are entitled to equal and unhesitating support. In this spirit, the flag of our country only recently became the impenetrable panoply of a homeless wanderer who claimed its protection in a distant sea; and, in this spirit, I am constrained to declare that there is no place accessible to human avarice or human lust or human force, whether the lowest valley or the loftiest mountain-top, whether the broad flower-spangled prairies or the snowy caps of the Rocky Mountains, where the Prohibition of Slavery, like the Commandments of the Decalogue, should not go." [1]

And these words, uttered more than six years ago, are still of vital, practical force. The example of Delaware shows how little Slavery it takes to make a Slave State, giving two votes to the ascendency of the Slave Power in the Senate. Be wakeful, then, and do not disparage that enemy which for sixty years has ruled the Republic. "That man is dangerous," exclaimed the Athenian orator, "who does not see danger in Philip." And I now say, that man is dangerous who does not see danger in the Slave Power.

When God created man in his own image, and saw that his work was good, he did not destine his creature for endless ages to labor without wages, compelled by the lash. Such degradation we seek to arrest by careful measures under the Constitution. And this is the cause of which your candidate is the generous and noble representative. Stand by him. Let not fidelity to those principles which give dignity and glory to Massachusetts, and to our common country, be an argument against him. From the malignity of enemies, from the

[1] The Landmark of Freedom: *ante*, Vol. III. p. 291.

vacillation of timeservers, and from the weakness of friends shield him by your votes. Make him strong to commence the great work by which the Declaration of Independence shall become a living letter, and the ways of Providence shall be justified to men.

> "If yet ye are not lost to common sense,
> Assist your patriot in your own defence;
> That stupid cant, 'He went too far,' despise,
> And know that to be brave is to be wise." [1]

[1] Swift, To the Citizens, 30–33. These words were introduced to sustain not merely the speaker, but also John A. Andrew, who was about to be nominated Governor of Massachusetts, and against whom this very accusation had been made.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SLAVERY SHOWN FROM ITS BARBARISM.

LETTER TO A POLITICAL ANTISLAVERY CONVENTION AT WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS, SEPTEMBER 9, 1860.

BOSTON, September 9, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — With you I hate, deplore, and denounce the Barbarism of Slavery, — believing that the *nonentity and impossibility* of Slavery under the Constitution of the United States can be fully seen only when we fully see its Barbarism; so that in the Constitutional argument against Slavery the first link is its essential Barbarism, with the recognition of which no man will be so absurd as to infer or imagine that Slavery can have any basis in words which do not plainly and unequivocally declare it, even if, when thus declared, it were not at once forbidden by the Divine Law, which is above all Human Law. Therefore in much I agree with you, and wish you God-speed.

But I do not agree that the National Government has power under the Constitution to touch Slavery in the States, any more than it has power to touch the twin Barbarism of Polygamy in the States, while fully endowed to arrest and suppress both in all the Territories. Therefore I do not join in your special efforts.

But I rejoice in every honest endeavor to expose the Barbarism which degrades our Republic; and here my

gratitude is so strong that criticism is disarmed, even where I find that my judgment hesitates.

Accept my thanks for the invitation with which you have honored me, and my best wishes for all Constitutional efforts against Slavery; and believe me, my dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

A. P. BROOKS, Esq.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT MUST BE A DEAD LETTER.

LETTER TO A PUBLIC MEETING AT SYRACUSE, NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 9, 1860.

THIS meeting was one of a series, known as "Jerry Rescue Celebration," being on the anniversary of the rescue of the fugitive slave Jerry from the hands of slave-hunters.

BOSTON, September 9, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — You know well how much I sympathize with you personally, and also how much I detest the Fugitive Slave Bill, as a flagrant violation of the Constitution, and of the most cherished human rights, — shocking to Christian sentiments, insulting to humanity, and impudent in all its pretensions. Of course I agree with you that such an enactment, utterly without support in Constitution, Christianity, or reason, should not be allowed to remain on the statute-book; and so long as it is there, I trust that the honorable, freedom-loving, peaceful, good, and law-abiding citizens, acting in the name of a violated Constitution, and for the sake of law, will see that this infamous counterfeit is made *a dead letter*. I am happy to believe that this can be accomplished by an aroused Public Opinion, which, without violence of any kind, shall surround every "person" who treads our soil with all safeguards of the citizen, teaching the Slave-Hunter,

whenever he shows himself, that he can expect from Northern men no sympathy or support in his barbarous pursuit.

At your proposed meeting, which it will not be in my power to attend, I trust that just hatred of Slavery in all its pretensions will be subjected to that temperate judgment which knows how to keep a sacred animosity within the limits of Constitution and Law.

Accept my thanks for the invitation with which you have honored me, and believe me, with much personal regard and constant sympathy,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

Rev. S. J. May.

EXAMPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS AGAINST SLAVERY.

SPEECH AT A MASS MEETING OF REPUBLICANS, IN THE OPEN AIR, AT MYRICK'S STATION, MASSACHUSETTS, SEPTEMBER 18, 1860.

A LARGE Republican meeting was held in the open air, at Myrick's Station, September 18, 1860, in Bristol County, Massachusetts. The New Bedford and Taunton Branch Railroad, and the Old Colony and Fall River Railroad, with their branches, were tasked to the utmost in bringing a crowd estimated at eight thousand. There were large delegations from New Bedford, Fall River, and Taunton.

Harrison Tweed, of Taunton, was chosen President, with a long list of Vice-Presidents and Secretaries. The speaking was from a stand in a beautiful grove. After Hon. Henry L. Dawes and Hon. Henry Wilson, Mr. Sumner spoke as follows.

FELLOW-CITIZENS, — Knowing well the character of the good people in the region where we are assembled, I feel that our cause is safe in your hands; nor do you need my voice to quicken the generous zeal which throbs in all your hearts. Proceeding from intelligence and from conscience, your zeal, I am sure, is wise, steady, and determined, even if it do not show itself in much speaking, — like your own faithful Representative in Congress, Mr. Buffinton, who never misses a vote, and whose presence alone is often as good as a speech. He will pardon me, if I say that I am glad to see him here among his constituents, so

many of whom I now meet for the first time face to face.

You would hardly bear with me, if, on this occasion, I undertook to occupy your time at length. There is a time for all things; and let me say frankly, that I have come here to mingle with my fellow-citizens, and to partake of their social joy, rather than to make a speech. And yet I cannot let the opportunity pass without undertaking for a brief moment to impress upon you our duties in one single aspect, — I mean *simply as citizens of Massachusetts*. Of course you have duties as men, belonging to the great human family; you have duties also as American citizens, belonging to this National Republic; and you have duties especially as citizens of Massachusetts, not inconsistent with those other duties, but merely cumulative and confirmatory. Happily, in all good governments duties do not clash, but harmonize; and we may well suspect any pretension, whatever name it assumes, which cannot bear this touchstone.

As *men*, our duties have been grandly denoted in that ancient verse which aroused the applause of the Roman theatre: —

"Myself a man, nought touching man alien to me I deem."[1]

What can be broader or more Christian than this heathen utterance? Sympathy, kindness, succor are due from man to man. This is a debt which, though daily paid, can never be cancelled while life endures. And this debt has the sanction of Religion, so that wrong to man is impiety to God. Of course, in the constant discharge of this debt, we must be the enemies of injustice,

[1] "Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto."
TERENT., *Heaut.* Act. I. Sc. i. 25.

wherever it shows itself. Nor can we hesitate because injustice is organized in the name of Law and assumes the front of Power. On this very account we must be the more resolute against it.

As citizens of the United States, our duties, fixed in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, are of the same character. I say, fixed in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence; for to these, as our guides, I look. Follow Nature, if you would be its interpreter. This is the Novum Organum of Lord Bacon. And so you must follow the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, if you would be their interpreter. This is the Novum Organum of the Republican party. Nothing can be clearer than that these two instruments, if followed to their natural meaning, are in harmony with all the suggestions of justice and humanity; so that our duties as men are all reaffirmed by our duties as American citizens.

And, lastly, as citizens of Massachusetts our duties are identical, but reinforced by circumstances in her history; so that, if, as men, or as citizens of the United States, we hesitate, yet as citizens of Massachusetts we are not allowed to hesitate. By the example of our fathers, who laid the foundations of this Commonwealth in knowledge and in justice, who built schools and set their faces against Slavery, we are urged to special effort. As their children, we must strive to develop and extend those principles which they had so much at heart, and which constitute their just fame.

In the recent conflicts of party it is common to heap insult upon Massachusetts. Hard words are often employed. Some of her own children turn against her. But it is in vain. From the past learn the future. See

how from the beginning she has led the way. This has been her office. She led in the long battle of argument which ended in the War of Independence, so that European historians have called our Revolutionary Fathers simply "the insurgents of Boston," and have announced the object of the war as simply "justice to Boston." And she has also led in all enterprises of human improvement, especially in the establishment of public schools and the abolition of Slavery. We are told that a little leaven shall leaven the whole lump; it is the Massachusetts leaven which is now stirring the whole country. Wherever education is organized at the public expense, or human rights are respected, there is seen the influence of Massachusetts, who has been not only schoolmaster, but chain-breaker. Such are her titles. Men may rail, but they cannot rail these away. Look at them in her history.

In the winter of 1620 the Mayflower landed its precious cargo on Plymouth Rock. This small band, cheered by the valedictory prayers of its beloved pastor, John Robinson, braved sea and wilderness for the sake of Liberty. In this inspiration our Commonwealth began. That same year, another cargo, of another character, was landed at Jamestown in Virginia. It was twenty slaves, — the first that ever touched and desecrated our soil. Never in history was greater contrast. There was the Mayflower, filled with men, intelligent, conscientious, prayerful, all braced to hardy industry, who before landing united in a written compact by which they constituted themselves "a civil body politic," bound "to frame just and equal laws." And there was the Slave-Ship, with its fetters, its chains, its bludg-

eons, and its whips, — with its wretched victims, forerunners of the long agony of the Slave-Trade, and with its wretched tyrants, rude, ignorant, profane,

> "who had learned their only prayers
> From curses,"

carrying in their hold that barbarous Slavery, *whose single object is to compel labor without wages*, which no "just and equal laws" can sanction. Thus in the same year began two mighty influences; and these two influences still prevail far and wide throughout the country. But they have met at last in final grapple, and we are partakers in the holy conflict. The question is simply between the Mayflower and the Slave-Ship, — which of the two to choose?

True to her origin, Massachusetts began at once that noble system of Common Schools which continues her "peculiar institution," while a College was founded at Cambridge which has grown to be a light throughout the land. Thus together began Common Schools and the College, and together they have flourished always. Said one of her early teachers, in most affecting words, — "After God had carried us safe to New England, and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civil government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity, dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches when our present ministers shall lie in the dust."[1] In this spirit it was ordered by the General Court, as early as 1642, "That in every town the chosen men appointed for

[1] New England's First Fruits: Coll. Mass. Hist. Soc., Vol. I. p. 242.

managing the prudential affairs of the same .... shall have power to take account from time to time of all parents and masters, and of their children, concerning their calling and employment of their children, especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of this country."[1] This was followed only a few years later, in 1647, by that famous law which ordered, "That every township in this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint one within their town to teach all such children as shall resort to him to write and read," and "that, where any town shall increase to the number of one hundred families or householders, they shall set up a grammar school, the master thereof being able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the University"; and this law, in its preamble, assigned as its object the counteraction of "one chief project of that old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures," and also "that learning may not be buried in the grave of our fathers in the Church and Commonwealth."[2] To nothing in her history can Massachusetts look with more pride than to this commanding example, which, wherever followed, must open wide the gates of human improvement.

Again, mindful that printing is the indispensable minister of good learning, they established a printing-press without delay. This was at Cambridge, as early as 1639, and the first thing printed was "The Freeman's Oath."

[1] Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay, Vol. II. p. 6, June 14, 1642.

[2] Ibid., p. 203, November 11, 1647.

Meanwhile the Slave-Ship continued its voyages and discharged its baleful cargoes. Virginia became a Slave State and the natural consequences of Slavery ensued. Of course the Common School was unknown; for, where Slavery rules, the schoolmaster is shut out. One of her Governors, Sir William Berkeley, said in 1671, "I thank God there are no free schools nor printing, and I hope we shall not have these hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them and libels against the best government. God keep us from both!"[1] These remarkable words, which embodied the political philosophy of Slavery, were in an official reply to interrogatories propounded from England.

Thus early was the contrast manifest, which has increased ever since. The evidence is unimpeachable, whether we consult the faithful historian who tells us that early in the last century Boston alone contained five printing-offices and many booksellers, while there was not a single bookseller in Virginia, Maryland, or Carolina,[2] — or consult the various statistics of the census in our day, where figures speak with most persuasive power for the Mayflower against the Slave-Ship.

While Massachusetts thus founded the School and the Printing-Press, what was her course on Slavery? Alas! not all that we could wish, but still enough to make her an example. Unhappily, Slavery, although in much mitigated form, came to be recognized here. But it never flourished, and it was from the beginning sur-

[1] Enquiries to the Governor of Virginia by the Lords Commissioners of Foreign Plantations, with the Governor's Answers: Hening, Statutes at Large of Virginia, Vol. II. p. 517.

[2] Oldmixon, British Empire in America, 2d ed., Vol. I. p. 195.

rounded with impediments to increase. To our glory let it be known that no person could be born a slave on our soil. This odious yoke was not transmissible in the blood. It ended with life, and did not visit itself upon the children of the slave-mother.[1] It appears also that the slave could take and hold property,[2] — which no American slave can now do. He could also testify in courts of justice, like a white man, — which no American slave, nor colored person in a Slave State, can now do. A slave, called "Andrew, Mr. Oliver Wendell's negro," also "Newtown Prince, a free negro," and "Cato, a negro man," were witnesses in the proceedings against the British soldiers for what is known as the Boston Massacre.[3] And still further, there were times when the negro, whether bond or free, was enlisted in the militia, and "enjoined to attend trainings as well as the English."[4] Indeed, as early as 1643, on the muster-roll of Plymouth is the name of "Abraham Pearse, the blackamore."[5] Thus, though Slavery had a certain recognition, it did not give its unjust law to the body politic and to the social life of Massachusetts.

It was natural, therefore, that her General Court should bear witness against "man-stealing." This it

[1] 4 Mass. R., 128, note; 16 Mass. R., 75; 10 Cushing, R., 410; 14 Allen, R., 562. See, *ante*, Vol. III. p. 384.

[2] New England Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. VI. p. 156.

[3] A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston, perpetrated in the Evening of the Fifth Day of March, 1770, by Soldiers of the XXIXth Regiment, to which is added an Appendix containing the several Depositions, etc., (Boston, 1770,) App., p. 56. Trial of William Wemms and others, Soldiers in his Majesty's 29th Regiment of Foot, for the Murder of Crispus Attucks and others, (Boston, 1770,) pp. 110, 111.

[4] Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay, Vol. III. p. 268, May 27, 1652.

[5] Records of the Colony of New Plymouth, Vol. VIII. p. 187, August, 1643.

For most of the foregoing particulars, see also Palfrey's History of New England, Vol. II. p. 30, note.

did as far back as 1646, in formal act worthy of perpetual memory. A Boston ship had brought home two negroes kidnapped on the coast of Guinea. Thus spoke the Massachusetts of that day: —

"The General Court, conceiving themselves bound by the first opportunity to bear witness against the heinous and crying sin of man-stealing, as also to prescribe such timely redress for what is past *and such a law for the future as may sufficiently deter all others belonging to us to have to do in such vile and most odious courses, justly abhorred of all good and just men*, do order that the negro interpreter, with others unlawfully taken, be, by the first opportunity, at the charge of the country for present, sent to his native country of Guinea, and a letter with him of the indignation of the Court thereabouts, and justice thereof." [1]

Mark the energy of this language. Here is an example, more than a century before Clarkson or Wilberforce, which blasts with just indignation the horrid crime still skulking beneath our national flag. The government that could issue this decree was inconsistent with itself, when it allowed a single person bearing the upright form of man to be held a slave, even for life, anywhere within its jurisdiction.

Slavery flees before the schoolmaster. As early as 1701, its injustice was formally declared by the town of Boston, whose Records contain the following vote, proper for adoption at this day: "The Representatives are desired to promote the encouraging the bringing of white servants, *and to put a period to negroes being slaves.*" [2] By this official corporate act, first of the kind in history,

[1] Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay, Vol. III. p. 84, November 4, 1646.

[2] Coll. Mass. Hist. Soc., 2d Ser., Vol. VIII. p. 184.

Boston stands foremost in the warfare with Slavery. Let her be proud of this post. Her wealth may depart, her warehouses may crumble, her ships may cease to cleave the seas with their keels, and her writers, too, may lose their charm; but this early record of justice and humanity will endure in never-failing brightness.

Other official acts followed. In 1705 a heavy duty was imposed upon every negro imported into Massachusetts. In 1712 the importation of Indians as servants or slaves was strictly forbidden. But the small number of slaves, and the mildness with which their condition was tempered, or, perhaps, a still immature public opinion, postponed definitive action on this great question until our controversy with the mother country, when the rights of the blacks were blended by all true patriots with the rights of the whites. James Otis, in pleading for the Colonies, denounced Slavery of all kinds, while Samuel Adams, on learning from his wife that she had received the gift of a female slave, exclaimed at once, "A slave cannot live in my house; if she comes, she must be free": she came, and was free.[1] Sparing all unnecessary details, suffice it to say, that, as early as 1769, the Superior Court of Massachusetts, anticipating the renowned judgment in Somerset's case, established the principle of Emancipation, and under its touch of benign power changed a chattel into a man. In the same spirit voluntary manumissions took place,—as by Jonathan Jackson, of Newburyport, who, in a deed, which may be found in the Probate Records of the County of Suffolk, declared that it was "in consideration of the impropriety long felt in holding any person in constant bondage, more espe-

[1] Wells, Life of Samuel Adams, Vol. I. p. 188.

cially at a time when his country is so warmly contending for the liberty every man ought to enjoy."[1] At last, in 1780, even before the triumph of Yorktown had assured that peace which set its seal upon National Independence, Massachusetts, enlightened by her common schools, filled with the sentiment of Freedom, and guided by Revolutionary patriots, placed in front of her Declaration of Rights the emphatic words, "All men are born free and equal," and by this solemn testimony, enforced by her courts, made Slavery impossible within her borders. From that time it ceased to exist, so that the first census after the adoption of the National Constitution, in the enumeration of slaves, contains a blank against the name of Massachusetts; and this is the only State having this honor. Thus of old did Massachusetts lead the way.

If all this be good for Massachusetts, if she has wisely rejected Slavery, then is it her duty to do for others within the reach of her influence what she has done for herself. And here her sons have not always been remiss. Follow her history, and you find that on the national field they have stood forth for the good cause. In 1785, one of her Representatives in the Continental Congress, the eminent Rufus King, moved the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories of the United States; and in 1787, Nathan Dane, another of her Representatives, reported the Ordinance for the Government of the Northwest Territory, containing this same prohibition. At a later day, when the Missouri Compromise was under discussion, that same son of Massachusetts, Rufus King, whose home was transferred to New York, showed himself inflexible against compro-

[1] Jackson's History of Newton, p. 336. See, *ante*, Vol. II. pp. 289, 290.

mise with Slavery, and in the Senate of the United States, with all his weight of years, character, and ability, led the effort to restrict it. John Quincy Adams, another son of Massachusetts, was at the time Secretary of State, and he enrolled himself on the same side. Afterwards, when the discussion of Slavery was renewed in Congress, this same champion, then a Representative from Massachusetts, entered the lists for Freedom, and in his old age, having been President, achieved a second fame. Slavery, now exalted by its partisans as beneficent and just, he exposed in its enormity; the knot of Slave-Masters who had domineered over the country he denounced with withering scorn; while he vindicated the right of petition, which Slave-Masters assailed, and upheld the primal truths of the Declaration of Independence, which Slave-Masters audaciously denied. Thus constantly spoke Massachusetts, and in her voice was the voice of the Mayflower against the Slave-Ship.

Plainly there is a common bond between the charities, so that one draws others in its train. And the grand charity for which we to-day bless our Commonwealth is only one of many by which she is already illustrious. Goodness grows by activity, and the moral and intellectual character which inspired Massachusetts to do what she has done for Freedom makes her active, wherever the suffering are to be relieved, wherever the ignorant are to be taught, or wherever the lowly are to be elevated, and enables her, though small in extent and churlish in soil, to exert a wide-spread power. This character has given her that name on earth which is a source of pride to her children. Strike out from her life all that is due to this influence, and how great

the blank in her history! I do not say that her children would disown her; but they would hardly rise up to call her blessed, as they now do.

It is our duty to keep Massachusetts in her present commanding position, — true to herself in all respects, — true to that Spirit of Liberty in which she had her origin, — true to the "just and equal laws" promised in the Mayflower, — true to her early and long-continued efforts against Slavery, — true to the declaration in her own Bill of Rights by which Slavery was abolished within her borders, — true to the examples of her illustrious representatives, Rufus King, Nathan Dane, and John Quincy Adams, — and, lastly, true to that moral and intellectual character which has made her the home of generous charities, the nurse of true learning, and the land of churches. This is our duty. And permit me to say, that this can be done now only by earnest, steadfast effort to arrest the power of Slavery, overshadowing the whole country, and menacing boundless regions with its malign influence. And this is the very purpose of the Republican party.

Against the Republican party are arrayed three factions, differing in name, differing superficially in professions, but all concurring in hostility to the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, and therefore all three Proslavery. As the Republican party represents the Mayflower, so do these three factions, whether fused or apart, represent the original Slave-Ship, — and you, fellow-citizens, are here to choose between them.

In this contest we appeal to all good citizens. We appeal alike to the Conservative and to the Reformer; for our reasonable and most moderate purpose com-

mends itself alike to both. To the Conservative it says, "Join us to preserve the work of our fathers, and to maintain the time-honored policy of Massachusetts." To the Reformer it says, "Join us to improve the human family, to support free labor, and to save the Territories from that deplorable condition where 'one man ruleth over another to his own hurt,' and human character suffers as much from the arrogance of the master as from the abasement of the slave, — a condition which is founded on nothing else but force, —

> 'the simple plan,
> That they should take who have the power,
> And they should keep who can.'" [1]

Our course is commended also by our candidates. Of Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Hamlin I have already elsewhere spoken, and know that in this presence it is needless to speak of Mr. Andrew. You all anticipate his praise before it can be uttered. Of unquestioned abilities, extensive attainments, and rare aptitude for affairs, his integrity has already passed into a proverb, and his broad sympathies cause us to forget the lawyer in the man. Nobody questions his intelligence, or the happy faculties which make him at home in all that he attempts. But it is sometimes complained that he has a "heart," as if this were dangerous in a Massachusetts Governor; and fears are excited because he is "honest," as if such a character could not be trusted. Thank God, he has a heart, and is an honest man. In these respects, and in his well-matured convictions, always expressed with honorable frankness, he embodies the historic idea of Massachusetts, and treads in the footsteps of the Fathers.

[1] Wordsworth, Rob Roy's Grave.

Fellow-citizens, if I have dwelt exclusively on our duties as citizens of Massachusetts, it is because I seek to impress these especially upon your minds. On other occasions I have treated other parts of the argument; but to-day my hope is to make you feel that you cannot turn from the Republican party without turning also from those principles by which Massachusetts has won her place in history, and without turning from the Mayflower, and its promise of "just and equal laws," to embark on that dismal Slave-Ship which in the same year first let loose upon our country all the cruel wrongs and woes of Human Bondage.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOLS FOR STATUE OF HORACE MANN.

LETTER TO THE AGENT FOR RECEIVING CONTRIBUTIONS, SEPTEMBER 19, 1860.

BOSTON, September 19, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — Surely the statue of Horace Mann ought to be made, and you are right in appealing for contributions to those who have been especially benefited by his noble labors. When I think of their extent and variety, embracing every question of human improvement, I feel that there are none to whom this appeal may not be confidently addressed.

I know nothing more appropriate or touching than the contributions you are gathering from the schools. It is true that there is no school in Massachusetts which has not been improved by his labors, and therefore no pupil or teacher who is not his debtor. But it is pleasant to feel that this debt is recognized.

I doubt not that every child who gives his "mite" will be happy hereafter in the thought, especially when he looks at the statue in the public grounds of the Commonwealth. He will of course have new interest in the man, and therefore a new and quickening example of excellence, which may send its influence through life. The teacher, besides sharing these feelings with the pupil, must look with grateful pride upon

a tribute which, so long as it endures, will proclaim the dignity of his profession.

The engraving of Mr. Mann is faithful and agreeable. I hope it may be in every school, so that children may early learn the countenance of their benefactor.

Believe me, dear Sir, with my best wishes,

Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

CHARLES A. PERRY, Esq.

REMINISCENCE OF THE LATE THEODORE PARKER.

REMARKS AT THE ANNUAL OPENING OF THE FRATERNITY LECTURES OF BOSTON, OCTOBER 1, 1860.

MR. SUMNER delivered the opening address for the season in the "Fraternity" Lectures, established by the Society bearing that name, of which Theodore Parker was the much-loved pastor. Before proceeding with his address he made a brief allusion to the great preacher and reformer. This was in the Tremont Temple. According to a newspaper of the time, "the immense hall was crowded in every part; not only were all the seats occupied, but also all available standing-room." "Mr. Sumner spoke two hours and five minutes, and commanded the entire attention of the audience to the close," and "was frequently interrupted by the most enthusiastic applause."

The address of the evening, on Lafayette, was again delivered a few weeks later in New York, and will be found in this collection at that date. The introductory words are given here.

FELLOW-CITIZENS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN: —

IN opening this course of lectures, devoted to Human Improvement, I cannot forget that noble spirit, especially dear to many of you as pastor, whom we had hoped to welcome at this time in restored health, instead of mourning dead in a distant land. I knew him well, and never came within his influence without confessing his many-sided powers, his marvellous acquirements, his rare eloquence, his soul touched to so many generous sympathies, and his heart beating warm for

his fellow-men. To the cause of Human Improvement, in every form, his life was given. For this he labored; for this he died.

It was my fortune to see him during several days in Paris, some time after he parted from you. He had recently arrived from the West Indies. I feel that I cannot err in offering a slight reminiscence of that meeting. I found him the same in purpose and aspiration as I had always known him, — earnest, thoughtful, and intent on all that helped the good of man, with the same completeness of intelligence, and the same large, loving heart. We visited together ancient by-ways and historic scenes of that wonderful metropolis, which no person was more forward to appreciate and to enjoy; but, turning from these fascinating objects, his conversation took the wings of the morning, and, traversing the Atlantic, rested on our own country, on friends at home, on his relations to his parishioners, on his unfinished labors, and on that great cause of Liberty, which contains all other causes, as the greater contains the less; for where Liberty is not, what is man, whether slave or master? Observing him carefully, with the fellow-feeling of a convalescent, I was glad and surprised to find in him so many signs of health. At that time he was stronger than I was; but he has been taken, and I am spared. Indeed, it was only in the husky whisper of his voice that he seemed weak. I envied him much his active step and his power to walk. But he had measured his forces, and calmly revealed to me his doubt whether he should live to see home again. If this were permitted, he did not expect to resume his old activities, but thought that in some quiet retreat, away from paved streets, surrounded by books, he might

perhaps have strength to continue some of his labors, to bind up some of his sheaves, and occasionally to speak with his pen. But it was ordered otherwise. Not even this moderate anticipation was gratified. The fatal disease had fastened too surely upon him, and was slowly mastering all resistance. The devotion of friends, travel, change of scene, the charms of Switzerland, the classic breath of Italy, all were in vain. It was his wish that he should be buried where he fell, and this child of New England, the well-ripened product of her peculiar life, now sleeps in Tuscan earth, on the banks of the Arno, near the sepulchres of Michel Angelo and Galileo. But I know not if even this exalted association can make us content to renounce the pious privilege of laying him in one of our own tombs, among the people that he loved so well.

Pardon me for thus renewing your grief. But I felt that I could not address you on any other subject until I had mingled my feelings with yours, and our hearts had met in sympathy for our great bereavement.

THREAT OF DISUNION BY THE SLAVE STATES, AND ITS ABSURDITY.

SPEECH AT A MASS MEETING OF REPUBLICANS, IN THE OPEN AIR, AT FRAMINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS, OCTOBER 11, 1860.

A MASS MEETING of Republicans was held in Harmony Grove at Framingham, October 11, 1860, with the following officers.

President, — Hon. Charles R. Train of Framingham.

Vice-Presidents, — A. C. Mayhew of Milford, Milo Hildreth of Northborough, Charles Devens of Worcester, Samuel M. Griggs of Westborough, William F. Ellis of Ashland, Alden Leland of Hollis-ton, John O. Wilson of Natick, Hollis Loring of Marlborough, James Moore of Sudbury, J. N. Bacon of Newton, Amory Holman of Bolton, S. D. Davenport of Hopkinton, George W. Maynard of Berlin, B. W. Gleason of Stowe, J. D. Wheeler of Grafton, Charles Campbell of Wayland, Sullivan Fay of Southborough, Albert Ballard of Framing-ham.

Secretaries. — Thomas W. Fox of Worcester, Nelson Bartholomew of Oxford, A. B. Underwood of Newton, and Theodore C. Hurd of Framingham.

The meeting was addressed, among others, by Hon. John P. Hale, Hon. Henry Wilson, and John A. Andrew, Esq., the Republican can-didate for Governor. The report at the time says: —

"While Mr. Wilson was speaking, Hon. Charles Sumner arrived upon the ground, and, on stepping upon the platform, was greeted with great ap-plause. At the close of the speech of Mr. Wilson, the President presented Mr. Sumner, who was received with nine hearty cheers. After silence was obtained, Mr. Sumner addressed the meeting."

This speech was quoted as the Framingham Speech by M. Cochin, the philanthropic Frenchman, in his important work, *L'Abolition de l'Esclavage*.[1]

[1] Tom. II. p. 155.

FELLOW-CITIZENS, — The German Siebold begins his great treatise on the "Anatomy of the Invertebrates" with this general remark: —

"The *Invertebrate* animals are organized after various types, the limits of which are not always clearly defined. There is, therefore, a greater number of classes among them than among the *Vertebrates.*"

In this remark of the illustrious naturalist I find an explanation of the number of parties now arrayed against us. On one side is the Republican party, openly declaring its principles, and looking with confidence to the Future. Threats of disunion, and menaces of violence, in constant cry, do not disturb it. Such a party may properly be called the *Backbone party*, or, adopting the phraseology of the German naturalist, the party of the *Vertebrates.*

But against the Republican party here in Massachusetts are three parties, or factions rather, which cannot be precisely named except from their candidates. Differing from each other superficially, they all concur in practical support of Slavery. At this moment, when the propagandists of Slavery insist upon its extension into the Territories, all these three factions lend themselves actively or passively to this work, and thus become practically Proslavery. Unwilling here in Massachusetts openly to advocate a wrong so unmistakable as Slavery, they find excuse in alleged danger to the Union, and bend before the threats and menaces of Slave-Masters. Not in the name of Freedom, which is really in danger, but in the name of the Union, which is only threatened, do they all three

rally against the Republican party. In their flexibility to threats and menaces, they show a want of that backbone which characterizes the Republican party. In short, though differing from each other, they all take their place among *Invertebrates*, which, according to the naturalist, are of more various types than *Vertebrates*.

There is the Bell faction, the Breckinridge faction, and the Douglas faction, all three *Invertebrates*, declaring that the Union is in danger, and asking your votes in order to save it. That is, they ask you to abandon cherished convictions, and to allow Slavery, with all its Barbarism, to enter the outlying Territories of the Republic, simply because certain Slave-Masters threaten disunion. Instead of opposing the treason which is threatened, Freedom-loving voters of the North are summoned to surrender. Instead of scorning the violence which is menaced, we are asked to cringe before it. I ask you if this is not the special point of every appeal by any speaker representing either of these factions? No man so audacious here in Massachusetts as to argue for Slavery openly. He knows that his argument would be scouted. It is therefore by appeal for the Union that people are deluded. In this way the weak are cajoled, the timeserving are seduced, and the timid are frightened; and people professing opposition to Slavery gravely come forward as supporters of these Proslavery factions.

The unknown is apt to be exaggerated; so that, if these threats of disunion were now heard for the first time, we might, perhaps, pardon men who yield to their influence. But since this is not the first time

such cries are heard, — since, indeed, they have been long sounding in our ears, so that their exact value is perfectly understood from the very beginning, — there seems no longer excuse or apology for hearkening to them. They are to be treated as threats, and nothing more. Look at them from the outset, and you will see their constant recurrence as weapons of political warfare.

Even while the Constitution was under discussion in the National Convention, the threats began. Georgia and South Carolina announced that they would not come into the Union, unless the African Slave-Trade, so dear in their sight, was allowed for twenty years under the Constitution; and the North ignominiously yielded this barbarous privilege, thus consenting to piracy. The cry from these States was then, "We will not come in." Ever since it has been, "We will not stay in."

One of the earliest and most characteristic outcries was on the ratification of Jay's Treaty in 1795. This famous treaty, negotiated by John Jay, at that time Chief Justice of the United States, under the instructions of Washington, provided for the surrender of the Western posts by Great Britain, and indemnity to our merchants for spoliations on their commerce, and also the adjustment of claims of British merchants upon our citizens. In the opposition which it encountered we meet the following threat of disunion in Virginia, published in Davis's Gazette, at Richmond.

"Notice is hereby given, that, in case the treaty entered into by that d—d arch-traitor, J—n J—y, with the British tyrant should be ratified, a petition will be presented to

the General Assembly of Virginia, at their next session, praying that the said State may *recede* [such was the word in that early day] from the Union, and be left under the government and protection of one hundred thousand free and independent Virginians.

"P. S. — As it is the wish of the people of the said State to enter into a treaty of amity and commerce and navigation with any other State or States of the present Union who are averse to returning again under the galling yoke of Great Britain, the printers of the (at present) United States are requested to publish the above notification."[1]

Thus early was this menace tried. But the treaty was ratified.

The menace was employed with more effect to secure the adoption of the Missouri Compromise. This was in 1820. Missouri applied for admission into the Union as a Slaveholding State. Her admission was opposed by the North on the declared ground that it was not right to give any such sanction to Slavery. Thus the whole Slave Question was opened; and it was discussed with much thoroughness and ability, under the lead of Rufus King, once an eminent representative of Massachusetts, but at that time a venerable Senator from New York. Overthrown in argument, the Slave-Masters resorted to threats of disunion. The Union was pronounced in danger, and under this cry a compromise, first suggested in the House by Louis McLane, a Representative from Delaware, and in the Senate by William Pinkney, a Senator from Maryland, was adopted, by virtue of which Missouri was admitted as a Slave State, while Slavery was prohibited in the remaining territory

[1] Collection of Papers on Political, Literary, and Moral Subjects, by Noah Webster, pp. 325, 326.

north of 36° 30′, at that time trodden only by Indians. The special operative gain to the Slave-Masters was the admission of Missouri as a Slave State, with two new slaveholding Senators to confirm their predominance in the Senate; and this was notoriously secured under threats of disunion, by which weak men at the North were intimidated.

A record at the time by the late Mr. Justice Story, who was then at Washington, shows the temper especially of Virginia. Writing to a friend at home, he says: —

"Mr. Randolph, in the House of Representatives, made a furious attack upon all who advocated the Compromise. He said: 'The land is *ours* [meaning Virginia's], and we will have it, and hold it, and use it as we [Virginians] please.' He abused all the Eastern States in the most bitter style, and intimated in the most direct manner that he would have nothing to do with them. 'We,' said he, 'will not cut and deal with them, but will put our hands upon our pockets and have nothing to do in this game with them.' His speech was a very severe philippic, and contained a great many offensive allusions. *It let out the great secrets of Virginia, and blabbed that policy by which she has hitherto bullied us, and led us, and wheedled us, and governed us.* You would not have supposed that there was a State in the Union entitled to any confidence or character, except Virginia." [1]

Such is the testimony of a tranquil observer, friend and associate of that illustrious Virginian, John Marshall, who witnessed this manifestation of the bullying spirit, and judged it.

[1] Letter to Stephen White, February 27, 1820: Life and Letters of Joseph Story, by his Son, Vol. I. p. 362.

Ten years passed, from 1820 to 1830, and the cry was raised again. It was now on the allegation of injustice in our Tariff. Here South Carolina took the lead, and openly threatened Nullification, — in the face of the arguments of Daniel Webster and the proclamations of Andrew Jackson. A modification of the tariff became necessary before this cry of "wolf" ceased. General Jackson, in a private letter written at the time, and now in the possession of our candidate, Mr. Andrew, predicts that "the Negro Question" will be the next occasion for it;[1] and he was right.

The subject of Slavery came up in Congress on petitions as early as 1835, and then commenced the great career of John Quincy Adams, as champion of Freedom, eclipsing even all his glories as diplomatist and President. At the presentation of petitions by this illustrious statesman, the old threats were revived; and falling before them, the Right of Petition itself was sacrificed. You all remember the depth of this humiliation.

This was followed by still another, on the introduction of the Wilmot Proviso, which was simply a proposition to prohibit Slavery in the Territories. The same threats broke forth with increased violence. Citizens at the North, while avowing hostility to Slavery, professed to be alarmed for the Union. Again they bowed, and in 1850 assisted in those Acts of Compromise, by which the Territories of Utah and New Mexico were left open to Slavery, and a Fugitive Slave Bill was passed, outraging alike every principle of Constitutional Liberty and every sentiment of Humanity. Here was surrender to this cry.

[1] See, *post*, p. 435, Remarks in the Senate, Dec. 10, 1860.

The menace of disunion at the South became chronic. Not a day passed that it was not uttered. At length, in 1856, John C. Fremont was nominated as candidate for the Presidency by the Republican party. As his election seemed at hand, we were again encountered by the same old threats. We were told, that, even if elected according to the forms of the Constitution, the Slave-Masters would not allow him to be inaugurated, and people at the North were summoned ignominiously to vote against him for the safety of the Union; and they surrendered to the call. Without this, John C. Fremont would have been chosen President. Thus again did the old menace prevail; and the chronic cry still continued, showing itself on the election of a Speaker, and then on the approval of Mr. Helper's book by sixty-seven Members of Congress.[1]

And now Abraham Lincoln is the candidate, instead of John C. Fremont. Again the threats are renewed with increased animosity, and you are asked to vote against a statesman of marked abilities and blameless character, representing the early sentiments of the Fathers, simply because Slave-Masters menace disunion in the event of his election. Bending with *invertebrate* backs before these threats, you are called to surrender your principles, your votes, and your souls.

Thus seven times, at seven different stages in our history, since the adoption of the Constitution, has this menace of disunion been made to play its part.

[1] *The Impending Crisis*, by H. R. Helper, containing a radical arraignment of Slavery, was recommended by Members of Congress.

Whatever it might have been at first, it is now nothing more than "second childishness and mere oblivion, *sans* everything." There is nothing in it which should not be treated with indignant contempt, certainly when employed here in Massachusetts to make us sacrifice our principles.

Absurd on the face, its absurdity is fully appreciated only when we consider its impotence as a remedy for the alleged grievances of the Slave States. They complain that fugitive slaves are not faithfully surrendered, — or, in other words, that some score or two of human beings, following the North Star, with the assistance of Northern men, succeed in securing their freedom. But disunion surely would be a poor remedy for this intolerable grievance; for it would leave them without even their present protection in this respect, without a Fugitive Slave Bill, or any constitutional safeguard, so that all fugitives, just so soon as they crossed the frontiers of the Slave States, would become free, — precisely as if Canada, with its British welcome to slaves, were carried down to the borders of Virginia and Maryland. If slaves escape now, what would they do then? If such things are done in the green tree, what would be done in the dry? Surely, in this case, it were better to

> "bear the ills they have
> Than fly to others that they know not of."

The other grievance is of the same character. The Slave-Masters complain, that, by the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, they are deprived of the opportunity of new Slave States through which their predominance in the Senate may be continued. But, pray, what remedy for this loss can be found in dis-

union"? Surely they cannot add to their present political strength by renouncing securities and dignities which they now enjoy in the national copartnership. It is true, that, while in the Union, they may be voted down on matters within the national jurisdiction and outside of the States; but they may nevertheless exert an influence, which on their withdrawal must be entirely renounced.

Such are the two grievances which are to justify disunion; and pardon me, if I venture to illustrate the irrational character of this remedy by an incident of scientific interest. The monkey in the *Jardin des Plantes* at Paris was found biting the rope by which he was suspended from the roof. "See," said the learned professor, "that monkey shows the difference between brutes and men. He sees what he is doing, but does not see the consequence,—that down he will fall." And the Slave States also bite the rope by which they are suspended, and, like the unreasoning brute, see not the consequence.

Yet more apparent is the absurdity of this threat, when we consider how it is to be accomplished. If the Slave States were solemnly unanimous at home, the cry might have a certain force. But it is well known that they are not unanimous. Whatever the threats of disorganizing extremists, the large mass of people even in the Slave States do not desire disunion. They keep aloof now from such threats, and openly declare their purpose to put down the traitors without assistance from the North; and this I cannot doubt would be done. Such men as Cassius M. Clay and the Blairs would find a field for their energies, and they would see at their side people who have not

hitherto acted with them gladly forgetting past differences for the sake of a common cause. Here are emphatic words, just uttered by a speaker at the South, in reply to Mr. Yancey, which show that any such attempt would fare badly, even at home: —

"I am one of a numerous party at the South, who will, if even Lincoln shall be elected under the forms of our Constitution and by the authority of law, without committing any other offence than being elected, force the vile disunionists and secessionists of the South to pass over our dead bodies in their march to Washington to break up this government."

But the absurdity of this threat glares upon us still more, when we reflect on the unhappy condition in which disunion would leave the seceding Slave States. Antiquity, by numerous instances, declares the danger from slaves, and history is continually verifying this truth. Even now, while I speak, we hear of insurrection at Norfolk, in Virginia, carrying with it widespread alarm, and the necessity for most especial vigilance. But in the event of disunion this condition would become permanent, so that life, if not a tragedy, would be a penance long drawn out. The whole region cursed with Slavery would be dotted over with fortifications and military posts; communities would be changed into camps carefully guarded against surprise; life would be as in Turkey or Tartary; and every Slave-Master would sleep with all the precautions of a highwayman fearing arrest, or of the mad prince, Don Carlos of Spain, who had two naked swords and two loaded pistols under his bed, and two arquebuses with powder and balls in his closet. The mother, as she

heard the fire-bell at midnight, would clasp her infant to her breast, fearful that at last the long hoarded resentments of the slave would be vindictively indulged. Even the soil, now so productive, would refuse its increase; for Nature herself would cease to smile amidst the alarms of servile war. Thus cruelly harassed and impoverished at home, the Slave States could find little comfort abroad. For a brief moment they might brave the scorn and contempt poured upon them; but they must fail to have the sensibilities of men, or they would at last shrink before the finger-point of the civilized world. The house of Lycaon, the cruel king of early Greece, was destroyed by the thunder of Jove, and the miserable monarch changed to a wolf. Such would be the doom of a State which set at defiance the laws of Humanity. It would have a *wolf's head*, and all would be against it.

The States which especially threaten secession are on the Mexican Gulf, and they have become known already as "The Gulf Squadron." Not yet wolves, they are now ships. Let them sail, with the black flag at the mast-head. I know not how the tale would end, but I know well that Slavery could not gain. Their dismal fate is, perhaps, prefigured in that of the slaver loaded down with its human cargo, where the crew were all struck with ophthalmia, and in this condition of blindness, while vainly striving to navigate the vessel, and weltering on the sea, were at last picked up by a charitable cruiser and carried into port. Or perhaps it is prefigured in that of the famous craft known in story as "The Flying Dutchman," which, darkened by piracy and murder, was doomed to perpetual cruise, unable to enter a port:—

"Faint and despairing on their watery bier,
To every friendly shore the sailors steer;
Repelled, from port to port they sue in vain,
And track with slow, unsteady sail the main.....
Unblest of God and man! Till time shall end,
Its view strange horror to the storm shall lend."[1]

Such is Disunion, in the history of its threats, — also in the reasons now alleged for it, the difficulties in its way, and its dismal consequences. But in all these aspects, from the beginning, we find but one supreme absurdity. It is the same, whether we ask Why? How? or What?

And yet you and I here in Massachusetts are summoned, under threats of disunion, to withdraw opposition to the extension of Slavery, and in token thereof to vote for Bell, or Breckinridge, or Douglas. I can do no such thing; nor do I see how any Northern man, with a head on his shoulders, or a heart in his bosom, or a backbone in his body, can do any such thing. Nor must fealty to the Union be measured by loud-mouthed profession. Not Cordelia, loving her father, in all simplicity, "according to her bond," but the sisters Goneril and Regan, so fervent in professions, sacrificed him. And I do not hesitate to declare that the Republican party is the only true Union party. In the first place, it is the only party which is not connected in some way, by association, affiliation, communion, or sympathy, with disunionists; and, in the second place, it is the only party which seeks the establishment of those national principles of Freedom on which the Union was originally founded, and without which it cannot exist in security or honor.

[1] Leyden, Scenes of Infancy, Part III.: Poetical Remains, pp. 373, 374.

As it is the only Union party, so the Republican party is the only Constitutional party. It is the only party which takes the Constitution unreservedly as guide, according to the spirit in which it was made, and the light of its Preamble, — rejecting the Proslavery interpretations adopted by the Bell faction, the Breckinridge faction, and the Douglas faction, all of which, in whatever form, are abhorrent to the spirit of the Constitution and the very words of its Preamble. In that Preamble it is declared that the Constitution is made to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Mark these important words. It is to establish justice: but Slavery is injustice. It is to insure domestic tranquillity: but Slavery insures domestic discord and insurrection. It is to provide for the common defence: but Slavery causes common weakness. It is to promote the general welfare: but Slavery perils the general welfare. Finally, it is to secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity: but Slavery sacrifices these blessings. Such is the Preamble, which is the key to the Constitution. The Republican party alone adopts its principles, as it alone adopts most honestly and sincerely the often declared opinions of its founders. Therefore it is the only Constitutional party.

For the Union and the Constitution, the Republican party is also the only party which maintains the great principles of Human Freedom. Thus in every respect is it commended to your support. The man who asks you here in Massachusetts to vote against it is either very weak, and believes in his own bad reasoning, or

very artful, and laughs in his sleeve at your credulity, or very spiteful, and allows all things, even his principles and his country, to be lost in the gratification of a vindictive temper. Look at your opponents here, and you will find that weakness, duplicity, and spite are the three main springs to their conduct. This is a severe analysis, but I think the facts support the assertion.

Frankness is not a virtue of our opponents, else we should have this issue between us more fairly stated. But you will not be deceived. You will see, that, amidst all disguises and subterfuges, the great question perpetually recurs: Are you for Freedom, or are you for Slavery? On this single question you are to vote; and no cry of "Disunion" can change the issue. Are you for Freedom in the Territories? Are you for a National Government administered in the spirit of the Fathers? Are you for the prostration of the Slave Oligarchy which now rules the country? Vain is the attempt to interpose other questions, even that of the Union itself; and vain is the attempt to separate the combatants. The ancient armies of Rome and Carthage fought on, unconscious of an earthquake which upheaved mountains, toppled down cities, and turned the course of rivers. But the animosity between Freedom and Slavery is not less implacable and self-forgetful. It can end only with the triumph of Freedom.

Freedom, which is the breath of God, is a great leveller; but it raises where it levels. Slavery, which is the breath of Satan, is also a great leveller; but it degrades everything, carrying with it master as well as slave. Choose ye between them; and remember that your first

SOUTHBRIDGE

duty is to stand up straight, and not bend before absurd threats, whether uttered at the South or repeated here in Massachusetts. Let people cry, "Disunion." We know what the cry means, and we answer back: The Union shall be preserved, and made more precious by its consecration to Freedom.

NO POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IN TERRITORIES CAN ESTABLISH SLAVERY.

SPEECH IN THE MECHANICS' HALL, WORCESTER, NOVEMBER 1, 1860.

THIS speech was made on the eve of the Presidential election, with the special purpose of sustaining Hon. Goldsmith F. Bailey, the Republican candidate for Congress in the Worcester District, against Hon. Eli Thayer, the previous Representative, who, failing to obtain the Republican nomination, became an Independent candidate. When it was known that Mr. Sumner had accepted an invitation from the Republican Committee to speak in the District, Mr. Thayer addressed him a letter, proposing a public discussion together on an evening named. To this challenge Mr. Sumner promptly replied in the following letter.

BOSTON, October 30, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — I make haste to acknowledge your favor of 29th October, that I may not seem for a moment to fail in any courtesy towards you.

I have been invited by the Republicans of Worcester to address them in support of their candidate, and have not felt at liberty to decline the invitation. But I should not like to take part in any controversy with an Opposition candidate, even had I been invited to do so.

Accept the good wishes which I sincerely cherish for your personal welfare, and believe me, dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

HON. ELI THAYER.

Mr. Sumner, yielding with reluctance to the pressure upon him, consented to speak on this occasion, solely with the desire of striking a last blow at a political heresy which stood in the way of establishing Freedom in the Territories, and of helping to save an important District of Massachusetts from being represented by one of its partisans. The speech is confined exclusively to the dogma or device of Popular Sovereignty, often called Squatter Sovereignty, in the Territories, which, after playing a conspicuous part in other sections of the country, at last found a supporter in Mr. Thayer, who gave to it certain importance, inasmuch as he had already done excellent service in organizing that Liberty-loving emigration which contributed so powerfully to the salvation of Kansas.

Though local in its immediate influence, the speech completes the series of efforts by which Mr. Sumner sought to fix the power of Congress to prohibit Slavery in the Territories, which was the great issue in the Presidential election. It is, perhaps, the last speech made anywhere on this topic, which unquestionably belongs to the history of the Slavery Question in our country. At its delivery there was much enthusiasm. The large hall was crowded for an hour before the meeting. Many hundreds, some from a distance, were compelled to return home, while others thronged the aisles and passage-ways. The effect of the speech was attested at the time by the public press, and also by correspondents. Mr. Bailey, the successful candidate, wrote as follows, under date of Fitchburg, November 10, 1860.

"Our District was carried on high points. Our triumph is one of principle. We were in danger at one time, and felt the need of a strong, manly blow from an authoritative source. You gave such a blow, and the result is, Mr. Thayer has a plurality in but eight of the thirty-seven towns comprising our District.

"The victory is not in any sense a personal one for me. But, as a member of the Republican party, a lover of the principles of personal liberty cherished by the Fathers, and an enemy of human slavery in all forms and *everywhere*, I must thank you from a full heart for the great and timely aid you then rendered to the cause in this District. Your reward, I know, is not in these thanks, but it is a satisfaction to me to express them."

Edwin Bynner, an energetic citizen of Worcester, who took a leading part in the canvass, wrote, under date of November 10, 1860 : —

"I cannot refrain from tendering to you personally my heartfelt thanks for your masterly speech in Mechanics' Hall, which, in my opinion, did more to avert our threatened defeat than any other instrumentality employed. In saying this, I would not for a moment disparage any effort put forth by others; but, having devoted my whole soul to the contest, having

expended every effort of mind and body, and believing that I *know*, as well, if not better, than others engaged in the fight, to whom the laurels really belong, I cannot repress avowal of the conviction, that, but for your speech, the event would have been at least doubtful. I am impelled to tender you my warmest personal gratitude for efforts which others halted and hesitated in making."

To these local testimonies may be added the words of Hon. Henry L. Dawes, who wrote, under date of North Adams, November 6, 1860 : —

"I desire to thank you, in the name of the Constitution, justice, and the cause, for your speech at Worcester. The argument was complete and unanswerable."

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF WORCESTER : —

ON my way to this place, my attention was attracted by a banner, flaunting over the highway, with these words : "TRUST THE PEOPLE." Nothing could be fairer or more seductive. In those simple words is embodied a principle, long unknown, and to this day often denied, which may be called the mainspring of Democratic institutions. Here is an implied assertion of the right of the people to govern themselves. And here also is an implied denial of all pretensions of Tyranny and Oligarchy. Such a principle, properly understood in its simplicity and just limitations, must find welcome in every Republican breast. Reading it on the banner, I responded with joy : "'Trust the People,' and Might will no longer make Right, Government everywhere will be founded upon the consent of the governed, and Slavery will become impossible!"

Studying the banner further, I found written above this fair device the names, "DOUGLAS AND JOHNSON." And then I was saddened to see how here in Massachusetts a great principle of human rights is degraded to be a cover for the denial of all rights. Of course the principles of these two candidates are understood.

Mr. Douglas, with vulgar insensibility to what is due to all who wear the human form, openly declares that "at the North he is for the white man against the *nigger*, but that further South he is for the *nigger* against the alligator," — and in this spirit says, "Vote Slavery up or vote Slavery down"; and such is the Popular Sovereignty which he proclaims. Mr. Johnson, who is his associate, declares, in well-known words, that "Capital ought to own Labor," — that is, that mechanics, workmen, and farmers, in fine, all who toil with hands, should be slaves; and this is the Popular Sovereignty which he proclaims. Surely this Douglas and Johnson Popular Sovereignty should rather be called Popular Tyranny. And here at the outset you will observe a wide distinction. Sovereignty is properly limited by *right;* Tyranny is without any limit except *force.* But when presented under the captivating device of "Trust the people," its true character is concealed. It is the Devil radiant with the face of an angel. It is an apple of Sodom, fair to the eye, but dust and ashes to the touch.

There are few among us who avow themselves supporters of Douglas and Johnson; or if they do, they have ceased to look for success in the coming Presidential election, which seems to be practically decided already. I should not be justified, therefore, in occupying your time to-night in considering their cunning artifice, if it were represented only by Douglas and Johnson, against whom you all stand ready to vote. To argue against these candidates here in Massachusetts, and especially in Worcester County, is as superfluous as to argue against King George the Third, whose ideas

of sovereignty were of the same tyrannical class, yet who was dead long ago.

But the same popular tyranny, misnamed Popular Sovereignty, upheld by these Presidential candidates, is also upheld by another candidate, now seeking your votes as Representative to Congress. Let me not do injustice to Mr. Thayer. I know well the points of difference between his theory and the theory of Douglas and Johnson; but I know also that in essential character they are identical,—so much so, that Mr. Douglas is reported to have hailed him, at the close of one of his speeches, as an authoritative expounder of the theory. The ancient Athenian, when praised in a certain quarter, exclaimed, "What bad thing have I done?" And Mr. Thayer, in earlier days, when doing so much for Freedom, would have been apt to turn from such praise with a similar exclamation.

It was natural that Mr. Douglas should praise him; for he gave the influence of character and ability to that pretension on which this reckless adventurer had staked his political fortunes. The fundamental principle of each is, that the question of Slavery in a distant Territory shall be taken from Congress and referred to the handful of squatters in the Territory, who, in the exercise of a sovereignty inherent in the people, and therefore called Popular Sovereignty, may "vote Slavery up or vote Slavery down." Of course Mr. Thayer, thanks to his New England home, has too much good taste to put forth this pretension in the brutal form it often assumes, when advanced by Mr. Douglas. He does not say that he is "for the white man against the *nigger* and for the *nigger* against the alligator." Perhaps the pretension becomes more dan-

gerous because presented in more plausible form, and made part of a more comprehensive system. All that Mr. Douglas claims for the squatters, in the exercise of Popular Sovereignty, is power over Slavery, and other domestic institutions; while Mr. Thayer claims for them, besides this power, the power also to choose their own officers, instead of receiving them from Washington. But the essential distinctive pretension of each is, that the handful of squatters is exclusively entitled, in the exercise of Popular Sovereignty, to pass upon the question of Slavery in the Territories, and to vote it up or vote it down, without any intervention from Congress.

If this principle were asserted only with regard to a single Territory, or even with regard to a single county or a single town, it ought to be opposed as fallacious and unjust; but when asserted as a general principle applicable to all the Territories of the Republic, it must be resisted, not only as fallacious and unjust, but as fraught with consequences difficult to measure. Glance for one moment at the vast spaces which it would open to this mad conflict, and you will be awed by the immensity of the question.

According to official documents, the whole territorial extent of the United States, including States and Territories, embraces about three million square miles. This in itself is no inconsiderable portion of the earth's surface. It is nearly ten times as large as Great Britain and France combined, — three times as large as the whole of France, Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark together, — only a little less than the whole sixty Empires, States, and Republics of all Europe, — and of equal extent with the

ancient Roman Empire, or the empire of Alexander, neither of which is said to have exceeded three million square miles. Of this vast area, about one half is now organized into States, leaving one million five hundred thousand square miles in the condition of outlying territory, whose future fortunes are involved in the decision of the present question.

If the subject assumes colossal proportions when we regard the extent of territory, it swells to yet grander form when we look at the population involved. The whole white population of the United States at the present moment amounts to 27,000,000. Supposing it to increase at the rate of 34 per cent in ten years, which may be inferred from the rate at which it has already increased, it will number in 1870, 36,000,000; in 1880, 48,000,000; in 1890, 64,000,000; in 1900, 85,000,000; in 1910, 113,000,000; in 1920, 151,000,000; in 1930, 202,000,000; in 1940, 270,000,000; in 1950, 361,000,000; and in 1960, just one hundred years from now, it will reach 483,000,000 of white freemen. Here we may well stop to take breath. Add to this white population 50,000,000 of colored population, whether free or slave, according to the supposed increase, and we shall have a sum-total of 533,000,000; and in two hundred years, with the same continuing rate of increase, our population will be ten times larger than that of the whole globe at the present hour.

This extraordinary multitude will not be confined to the present States. It will diffuse itself in every direction, covering all our territory as the waters cover the sea. Precisely how it will be distributed it is impossible to foreknow. But the tendency of population is Westward. The Eastern States are becoming station-

ary. Assuming that in 1960 the area now unoccupied will be settled at the rate of Massachusetts in 1850, which was 127 to the square mile, we shall then have on that territory a white population of 190,000,000. And the simple question is, Whether this enormous territory, with this enormous population, shall be exposed to all the accumulating evils of Slavery, with their hateful legacy, at the mere will of the handful of first settlers? According to a French proverb, "It is only the first step which costs," and there is profound truth in this saying. In similar spirit the ancient Romans said, *Obsta principiis*, "Oppose beginnings."

Never were these time-honored maxims more applicable than in the present case, when such prodigious results are involved. All experience shows that it takes very little Slavery to constitute a Slave State, and that Slavery, when once introduced, is most tenacious of existence. Mr. Lincoln, in one of his speeches, has aptly likened it to the Canada thistle, which, when once planted, extends with most injurious pertinacity. Others liken it to a cancer or vicious disease, which, when once in the system, corrupts the blood forever. It may be likened to a superstitious usage, which, when once established in the customs of a people, yields reluctantly to every effort against it. And yet Mr. Thayer wrests from Congress, representing the whole country, all power to prevent the introduction of this transcendent evil, and transfers the whole question to a handful of squatters, who are to act for the weal or woe of half a continent with teeming millions of population; and this is done in the name of Popular Sovereignty, as announced in the Declaration of Independence.

Fellow-citizens, I deny this pretension in every respect and at every point. I assert the power of Congress, founded on reason and precedent; and I assert the overwhelming necessity at this moment of exercising this unquestionable power. Guardians of this mighty territory, the destined home of untold millions, we must see that it is securely consecrated to the uses of Freedom, so that it cannot be pressed by the footsteps of a slave. For the moment we are performing the duty of *conditores imperiorum*, or founders of States, which Lord Bacon, in sententious wisdom, places foremost in honor, and calls a "primitive and heroical work."[1] In the discharge of this duty, every power, every effort, every influence for Freedom should be invoked. The angel at the gates of Paradise, with flaming sword turning to every side, might be fitly summoned to guard this grand inheritance.

Not only do I assert this power, but I deny that sovereignty, when justly understood, has among its incidents the right to enslave our fellow-man. Mr. Thayer practically recognizes this incident; for he insists upon leaving the handful of squatters in the Territories to vote Slavery up or vote Slavery down without any intervention from Congress. And here is the vital question: Is there any such power incident to sovereignty?

And since the Declaration of Independence is invoked as authority for this new pretension, I shall bring it precisely to this touchstone. Bear with me, if I am tedious.

On the 4th of July, 1776, was put forth that great

[1] Essays: Of Plantations.

state paper, which constitutes an epoch of history. Its primary object was to dissolve the bonds which existed between the Colonies and the mother country. For this purpose a few positive words would have sufficed. But its authors were not content with this enunciation. Ascending far above the simple idea of National Independence, they made their Declaration an example to mankind, in two respects: first, as a Declaration of Human Rights; and, secondly, as an admission that the Sovereignty which they established was limited by Right.

In the first place, they declared "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Note well these words. Here was a Declaration of Natural Rights, the first ever put forth in history, unless we except the declaration only a few months earlier in Virginia. In England there have been Bills of Rights, beginning with Magna Charta, all declaring simply the rights of Englishmen, and all founded on concession and precedent. Now came a Declaration of the Rights of Man, not founded on concession or precedent, but founded on Nature. And this Declaration, though made the basis of the new government, was universal in application, so that people, wherever struggling for rights, have been cheered by its words.

There is another enunciation, by which the Declaration is equally memorable, although this feature has been less noticed. Certainly it has not been noticed by Mr. Thayer, or he would never venture to derive

his pretension from a Declaration which positively excludes all such idea. Other governments, even those of the American Colonies, have been founded on *force*, and the sovereignty which they claimed was unlimited, so as to sanction Slavery. That I may not seem to make this statement hastily, pardon me, if I adduce two illustrative authorities. I refer first to Sir William Blackstone, the commentator on the Laws of England, who says: "There is and must be in all forms of government, however they began, or by what right soever they subsist, a supreme, irresistible, absolute, uncontrolled authority, in which the *rights of sovereignty* reside;"[1] and this power, which in England is attributed to Parliament, he calls in one place "that *absolute despotic power* which must in all governments reside *somewhere*."[2] I refer also to the famous Dr. Johnson, who, in his tract entitled "Taxation no Tyranny," openly says that "all government is ultimately and essentially absolute"; that "in sovereignty there are no gradations"; that "there must in every society be some power or other from which there is no appeal," which "extends or contracts privileges, exempt itself from question or control, and bounded only by physical necessity."[3]

In the face of these contemporary authorities, one an eminent jurist, and the other an eminent moralist, both well known to our fathers, and in the face of all traditions of government, the Declaration of Independence disclaimed all despotic, absolute, or unlimited power, and voluntarily brought the new sovereignty

[1] Commentaries, Vol. I. p. 49.
[2] Ibid., p. 160.
[3] Works, (Oxford, 1825,) Vol. VI. p. 234.

within the circumscription of *Right*. Not content with declaring that the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are inalienable, and therefore beyond the control of any sovereignty, the Declaration went further, and, by abnegation worthy of perpetual honor, solemnly restrained the new sovereignty, — simply claiming for it the "power to do all acts and things which independent states may OF RIGHT do." Even had this express limitation been omitted, no such incident of sovereignty as that asserted by Mr. Thayer could be derived from an instrument containing those words with which the Declaration begins; but with these latter words of special limitation, the pretension becomes absurd.

Such, fellow-citizens, is the Popular Sovereignty of the Declaration of Independence, drawing its life, first, from the inalienable Rights of Man, and then, by positive words, restrained to what is Right. And this is the Popular Sovereignty which, lifting the down-trodden and trampling on tyrants, — now gentle as Charity, and then terrible as an army with banners, — is destined to make the tour of the world, rendering Slavery everywhere impossible.

Of this Popular Sovereignty I have spoken on another occasion,[1] and I refrain with difficulty from repeating now what I said then, partly because I believe so completely in its truth and rejoice in its utterance, but more because I learn that it has been wrested from its place to cover the Popular Tyranny, misnamed Popular Sovereignty, which Mr. Thayer so ardently vindicates.

How strange that words which hail the Angel of

[1] *Ante*, p. 251.

Human Liberation, with Liberty and Equality in her glorious train, should be invoked in support of a wicked tyranny, which, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, makes merchandise of our fellow-man! Face to face against this wretched pretension I put the true Popular Sovereignty, with Liberty and Equality for all, guarded and surrounded by the impassable limitation of Right, which is the god Terminus, never to be overthrown. Within these great precincts there can be no Slavery, nor can there be any denial of Equal Rights. How, then, can any man, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, vote another to be a slave? How, then, can any man, in this name, assert property in his fellow-man? By what excuse, with what reason, on what argument can any such thing be done, without first denying all that is true and sacred? Liberty, which is the active principle of Popular Sovereignty, — Equality, which is twin sister of Liberty, — and Justice, which sets bounds to all that men do on earth, — these are the irresistible enemies of Slavery, each and all of which must be trampled out by any rule under which man can be made a slave. But these, each and all, constitute that Popular Sovereignty which is the glory of our institutions. Anything else calling itself by this great name is a mockery and a sham, fit only for hissing and scorn.

The Declaration of Independence gave dignity to our Revolutionary contest, and made it a landmark of human progress. Here, at last, the rights of man were proclaimed, and a government was organized in subjection to the sovereign rule of Right. The people, while lifting themselves to the duties of sovereignty, bowed before that overruling sovereignty whose seat is the bosom of God. Such an example became at once a

guide to mankind. It was copied in France, under the lead of Lafayette; and there is no people struggling for Right in either hemisphere who have not felt its inspiration. And yet this Declaration, standing highest among the historic landmarks of our country, is now assailed and dishonored.

It is assailed and dishonored, first, by denial of these natural rights which it so gloriously declares. This is done often with a jeer. Forgetful that these rights were divinely established at the very Creation, when God said, "Let us make man in our image," and then again in the Gospel, when it was said, "God hath made of one blood all nations of men," — forgetful that these rights are stamped by Nature on all who wear the human form, — forgetful also that they belong to those self-evident truths, sometimes called axioms, which are universal in their application, as the axiom in arithmetic that two and two make four, and the axiom in geometry that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, — forgetful of the true glory of our country, these primal truths are sometimes scouted as "absurd," sometimes as "splendid generalities," and sometimes as a "self-evident lie." This assault, though proceeding from various voices, originated with Mr. Calhoun. He is its first author.

And now, secondly, the Declaration is assailed and dishonored by the claim, that men, in the exercise of sovereignty derived from the Declaration, may set up on an auction-block their fellow-men, if to them it seems fit, and that this power is an incident of Popular Sovereignty. This pretension, first put forth by General Cass, in 1847, when a Presidential candidate,[1] and now

[1] Letter to A. O. P. Nicholson, December 24, 1847.

revived by Mr. Douglas, who peddles it throughout the country, is also practically adopted by Mr. Thayer, as part of his peculiar Territorial policy. Such a pretension is hardly less degrading to the Declaration than the open mockery of its primal truths by Mr. Calhoun. The latter, as is well known, denied the sovereignty of the people in the Territories, but he agreed, heart and soul, in the pretension that the right to enslave a fellow-man is an incident of sovereignty, wherever it exists.

Thus do these two assaults upon the Declaration practically proceed from one source. In their essential ideas they are *Calhounism.*

On the other side is arrayed a name illustrious for various public service, and for unsurpassed championship of Freedom: I mean John Quincy Adams. Entering the House of Representatives after a long life, at home and abroad, as Senator, as Minister, as Secretary of State, and finally as President, he added to all these titles by the ability and constancy with which he upheld the Rights of Man. Mr. Calhoun was at this time in the Senate; but Mr. Adams incessantly met all his assumptions for Slavery,—exposing its hateful character, insisting upon its *prohibition* in the Territories, and especially vindicating the Declaration of Independence. Never has the recent pretension, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, been more completely anticipated and exposed. And now, that this argument may not stand entirely upon my words, I quote from him. Says John Quincy Adams, in his oration on the Fourth of July, 1831, at Quincy:—

"Unlimited power belongs not to the nature of man, and rotten will be the foundation of every government leaning upon such a maxim for its support. . . . . The pretence of an

absolute, irresistible, despotic power existing in every government *somewhere* is incompatible with the first principle of natural right. . . . . The *sovereignty* which would arrogate to itself absolute, unlimited power must appeal for its sanction to those illustrious expounders of Human Rights, Pharaoh of Egypt and Herod the Great of Judea." [1]

In another passage of the same oration, the patriot statesman says, in words which answer a portion of Mr. Thayer's arguments: —

"It has sometimes been objected to the Declaration, that it deals too much in abstractions. But this was its characteristic excellence; for upon those abstractions hinged the justice of the cause. Without them our Revolution would have been but successful rebellion. Right, truth, justice are all abstractions. The Divinity that stirs within the soul of man is abstraction. The Creator of the universe is a spirit, and all spiritual nature is abstraction. Happy would it be, could we answer with equal confidence another objection, not to the Declaration, but to the consistency of the people by whom it was proclaimed!" [2]

These same views were enforced again by Mr. Adams in his oration at Newburyport, July 4, 1837. There he uses words which reveal the limits of Popular Sovereignty. Thus he speaks: —

"The sovereign authority conferred upon the people of the Colonies by the Declaration of Independence could not dispense them, nor any individual citizen of them, from the fulfilment of all their moral obligations. . . . . The people who assumed their equal and separate station among the powers of the earth, by the laws of Nature's God, by that very act acknowledged themselves bound to the observance of those

[1] Oration at Quincy, pp. 13, 14.
[2] Ibid., p. 18.

laws, *and could neither exercise nor confer any power inconsistent with them.*" [1]

Then alluding to the self-imposed restraints upon the sovereignty which was established, our teacher says: —

"The Declaration acknowledged a rule of *Right* paramount to the power of independent states itself, and virtually disclaimed all power to do *Wrong*. This was a novelty in the moral philosophy of nations, and it is the essential point of difference between the system of government announced in the Declaration of Independence and those systems which had until then prevailed among men. . . . . It was an experiment upon the heart of man. All the legislators of the human race until that day had laid the foundations of all government among men in *Power;* and hence it was that in the maxims of theory, as well as in the practice of nations, sovereignty was held to be unlimited and illimitable. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed another law, ... a law of *Right*, binding upon nations as well as individuals, upon sovereigns as well as upon subjects. . . . . In assuming the attributes of *sovereign power*, the Colonists appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, and neither claimed nor conferred authority to do anything but *of Right.*" [2]

Such is the irresistible testimony of John Quincy Adams. On the other side are arrayed John C. Calhoun, Stephen A. Douglas, and Eli Thayer. Choose you between these two sides.

Enough, perhaps, has been said. But I shall not leave this question merely on reason and high authority, decisive as they may be. I appeal, further, to

[1] Oration at Newburyport, p. 24.
[2] Ibid., pp. 26, 27.

the practice of the National Government, which from the beginning has sanctioned the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories. The pretension of Popular Sovereignty is altogether a modern invention, unknown to our fathers.

The positive Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories was proposed in the Continental Congress by Mr. Jefferson, as early as 1784. Thus did the hand which drew the Declaration of Independence first assert the practical application of its principles within the jurisdiction of Congress; and here the Popular Sovereignty of the Declaration receives most instructive illustration. Although the proposition had in its favor a majority of all the delegates then present, and also a majority of all the States then present, yet, under the rules of the Continental Congress, it failed for the moment. But there is no evidence that anybody questioned the power of Congress, or claimed Sovereignty for any handful of squatters.

The following year, in the absence of Mr. Jefferson, the Prohibition was proposed by Rufus King, a delegate from Massachusetts. It was afterwards embodied by Nathan Dane, another delegate from Massachusetts, in the Ordinance for the Government of the Northwest Territory; and finally, on the 13th of July, 1787, a day ever memorable in the annals of Human Freedom, it was carried with only one vote in the negative, and became the corner-stone of those imperial States destined to exercise such controlling influence in our history. Thus early did our Commonwealth, through its faithful Representatives, insist upon Prohibition by Congress. This was before the National Constitution.

The Ordinance thus adopted by the Continental Con-

gress was affirmed in August, 1789, by the first Congress that sat under the Constitution, in a law which bears the signature of George Washington. In pursuance of its provisions, Ohio was admitted into the Union, 19th February, 1803; Indiana, 11th December, 1816; Illinois, 3d December, 1818; Michigan, 26th January, 1837; and Wisconsin, 29th May, 1848. In the various Acts of Congress preparatory to the admission of these States, the validity of the Ordinance was recognized to the fullest extent. Meanwhile the same principle was applied in the Missouri Compromise, under which Slavery was prohibited by Congress in all the territory west of the Mississippi and north of 36° 30′; also in the organization of Iowa as a Territory, 12th June, 1838, and especially of Oregon as a Territory, 14th August, 1848. Thus from the beginning has this power been affirmed by successive Congresses and by successive Presidents, from George Washington to James K. Polk. It is impossible to present any principle in our history sustained by a line of precedents so imposing.

The necessity of this Prohibition, as a safeguard to the Territories, is apparent from well-attested occurrences. The people of the Territory of Indiana, embracing the larger part of the whole of the Northwestern Territory, in 1802, then again in 1805, then again in 1807, and at other times also, with the pertinacity which marks all struggles for Slavery, petitioned Congress to suspend the Prohibition, so as to allow the introduction of slaves, if the squatters should desire it. To the honor of Congress, their petitions were rejected; but they are memorable from a brief report adverse to their passage by John Randolph, of Virginia. Here it is, bearing date 2d March, 1803.

"That the rapid population of the State of Ohio sufficiently evinces, in the opinion of your Committee, that the labor of slaves is not necessary to promote the growth and settlement of colonies in that region. That this labor, demonstrably the dearest of any, can only be employed to advantage in the cultivation of products more valuable than any known to that quarter of the United States. That the Committee deem it *highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the Northwestern country*, and to give strength and security to that extensive frontier. *In the salutary operation of this sagacious and benevolent restraint* it is believed that the inhabitants of Indiana will at no very distant day find ample remuneration for a temporary privation of labor and of emigration."[1]

With these benignant and most suggestive words of an eminent Slave-Master Congress happily concurred, and the Prohibition was confirmed. Had the modern pretension of Popular Sovereignty then prevailed, the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, instead of becoming the smiling home of Free Labor, would be suffering from the blight of Slavery, — instead of joining in triumphant vote for Lincoln, they would, like their neighbor, Missouri, be linked with the Slave States in support of Breckinridge, or Bell, or Douglas, and would constitute part of that Slave Power under whose tyranny the country has so long suffered.

The advantage of the Prohibition is as clear as its necessity. I do not dwell on the comparison between Free States and Slave States, between free labor and slave labor, between the social system fostered by Freedom and the social system engendered by Slavery, be-

[1] Annals of Congress, 7th Cong. 2d Sess., 613, 1353. At a later day the tone of Mr. Randolph was different. See, *ante*, p. 298.

tween the civilization of the one and the barbarism of the other; but I call attention simply to two States, covering nearly the same spaces of latitude, resembling each other in soil, climate, and natural productions, lying side by side, and organized at about the same time, — Illinois, thanks to the Prohibition, a Free State, and Missouri cursed with more than one hundred thousand slaves. Look at the statistics of these two States, if you would know the contrast which day by day magnifies the Prohibition.

And yet, in the face of all this experience, showing, first, the necessity of Prohibition as a safeguard to the Territories, and, secondly, its immeasurable advantages, you are now called to abandon the early policy of the Republic, to turn your back upon this policy as irrational and unwise, and to adopt a new pretension, with a plausible name, which, in the only instance where it has been tried, produced discord, strife, and blood. You are called to give up the old Aladdin's Lamp of magical power, filling the land with infinite treasures and the true nobility of Freedom, and to take in exchange a new patent article now hawked about the streets of Worcester.

If this recent pretension, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, were merely an idea and nothing more, coined in the brain of an ingenious theorist, but not pressed persistently at all times into practical application, it might be left with kindred errors to pass away quietly into the limbo of things lost on earth, as described by Milton: —

> "then reliques, beads,
> Indulgences, dispenses, pardons, bulls,
> The sport of winds."

But unhappily this is not the case.

Such a pretension, espoused with ardor, as a practical rule, must naturally exercise a disturbing influence. You have not forgotten its influence on General Cass, who, yielding to it, violated the instructions of his State and voted against the Prohibition. You all know its influence on Mr. Douglas. In the name of this pretension he overturned the time-honored Prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory, and delivered over Kansas to a conflict where fraud, rapine, and murder stalked with impunity. Afterward, in the name of this pretension, he sought to arrest all action by Congress for the relief of the settlers there. And ever since he has made this pretension a plain "dodge," in order to avoid the urgent question: Are you for Freedom, or are you for Slavery? on which every citizen ought to say plainly, "Yea" or "Nay."

It has not been the lot of your Representative to play a part so conspicuous as that of Mr. Douglas. But this pretension has changed his course hardly less than it has varied the course of the Presidential candidate, driving him into acts which only his large ingenuity in "making the worse appear the better reason" can save from an outburst of universal and indignant condemnation. And now, as I touch briefly on these acts, let me say that I do it most reluctantly, most painfully, and only in obedience to the absolute exigencies of this discussion, that you may truly understand the character of the pretension on which you are to pass judgment at the polls.

Surely its *disturbing influence* is manifest in his vote on the Bill to annul the Slave Code of New Mexico, under which not only slavery of blacks, but also serfdom of whites is recognized, while laborers of all kinds

are subjected to be cuffed, flogged, beaten, or otherwise punished by their employers, without any redress at law. The blood freezes at the idea of such a code extant in a Territory within the jurisdiction of Congress. And yet, on the ayes and noes upon declaring this code null and void, Mr. Thayer's name is recorded "no," with the ninety Proslavery Democrats and Americans, against ninety-seven Republicans; and thus you, fellow-citizens of Worcester, whose Representative he then was, have been made parties to an odious crime. I use plain language; for only in this way can that atrocious code be characterized, which in itself is the paragon and *ne plus ultra* of cold-blooded, scientific, and most cruel tyranny.

Surely its *disturbing influence* is again manifest in his vote on the Bill to abolish Polygamy in the vast Territory of Utah, where Brigham Young with his forty wives repeats the scandal of a Turkish harem within the jurisdiction of Congress. On the ayes and noes, Mr. Thayer's name is found in the small minority of sixty noes, composed of *ultraists* of Proslavery, against one hundred and forty-nine ayes; and you, fellow-citizens of Worcester, whose Representative he then was, have been made parties to the sanction of Polygamy. It is natural that the partisans of Slavery, which nullifies the relation of husband and wife, should be indifferent to this disgusting offence; but nothing short of a most potent disturbing influence could have brought your Representative to a similar indifference.

Surely its *disturbing influence* is again manifest in his course on the Territorial Bills reported by Mr. Grow from the Committee on Territories, for the organization of the five Territories of Idaho, Nevada, Ari-

zona, Dakota, and Chippewa, all of which were tabled by the vote of Mr. Thayer, and all but one on his motion. Afterward, in debate, he boasted that he "had taken the lead in this business of killing off these Territorial organizations, which go upon the assumption that the people in a Territory are infants,"[1] thus setting up this disturbing pretension as his apology, and claiming for squatters a tyrannical power.

Surely its *disturbing influence* is again manifest in his perversion of unquestionable facts of history with regard to the operation of the Ordinance for the Government of the Northwestern Territory, saying that Freedom was secured in that Territory through Popular Sovereignty and not through the Ordinance; whereas history shows, by unimpeachable evidence, that this great work was accomplished through the Ordinance. Read the able speech of the Republican candidate, Mr. Bailey, if you would appreciate the extent of this perversion.

Surely its *disturbing influence* is again manifest in the language by which he allows himself to disparage that great cause, so dear to the people of Worcester, which first brought him into public life: saying that the principle of Prohibition, introduced by Jefferson, approved by the Fathers, and now amply vindicated by its fruits, is a "humbug"; and then again saying, "I think the Slave Question is altogether too small a question to disturb so great a people as inhabit the United States of America": thus confessing insensibility to the grandeur of that question now overshadowing all other questions, which it is the first duty of a statesman in our country to understand and to appreciate.

[1] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 2078, May 11, 1860.

Surely its *disturbing influence* is again manifest in the tone and manner which he has adopted toward the Antislavery cause, and its supporters in Congress, as will be seen by all who read his speeches there. Let the good people of this district know these things, and say if they are ready to join in such contumely.

And, lastly, the *disturbing influence* is manifest in his setting himself up as an independent candidate for Congress, against the Republican party, whose Presidential candidate he professes to support.

It will be for you to determine, whether a candidate, under this *disturbing influence*, thus repeatedly manifest in signal acts, can adequately represent the active, conscientious, Freedom-loving citizens of Worcester, who oppose Slavery by something more practical than a theory. I do not doubt his integrity; nor do I utter one word against his personal character. I speak of him only as a public man, open to criticism for public acts; and I speak solemnly and sincerely, for the sake of the cause which I have at heart. Honest men with a false theory are sometimes as dangerous as bad men. I would not liken Mr. Thayer to Benedict Arnold; but there is a letter of the latter, immediately after his defection, addressed to Washington, which your Representative might adopt. Here it is.

"On Board the Vulture,
25 September, 1780.

"Sir, — The heart which is conscious of its own rectitude cannot attempt to palliate a step which the world may censure as wrong. I have ever acted from a principle of love to my country, since the commencement of the present unhappy contest between Great Britain and the Colonies. The same principle of love to my country actuates my present

conduct, however it may appear inconsistent to the world, who very seldom judge right of any man's actions." [1]

The difference between the two cases is obvious. One is flat treason: the other is flat delusion. One is a crime which history can never pardon: the other is a mistake over which history will drop a tear.

Fellow-Republicans, you are about to choose Abraham Lincoln President. Of his election there is no reasonable doubt. Under his auspices the National Government will be brought back to the original policy of the Fathers, which placed Slavery, so far at least as it is outside the States, within the jurisdiction of Congress. It was for his fidelity to this principle, vindicating it against the pretension of Popular Sovereignty, in his long debate with Mr. Douglas, and openly declaring, that, "if he were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether Slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, he would vote that it should, in spite of the Dred Scott decision," [2] — on this account it was that Mr. Lincoln was eligible as the Republican candidate. But it is not enough to make him President. You must see that he is sustained in this fundamental principle by your Representative in Congress. And since his election is now beyond question, the vote for a Representative true to this principle becomes more important than a vote for him. Little good will you do in voting for him, if at the same time you vote for a Representative pledged to defeat his declared policy.

[1] Writings of Washington, ed. Sparks, Vol. VII., Appendix, p. 533.

[2] Speech at Chicago, July 10, 1858: Political Debates between Lincoln and Douglas, p. 20.

Vote, then, so as to vindicate the declared policy of your candidate for the Presidency.

Vote so as to vindicate the Declaration of Independence, which is dishonored by being made the authority for a false pretension in the name of Popular Sovereignty.

Vote so as to vindicate the early policy of the Fathers, who organized the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories.

Vote so as to vindicate the early policy of Massachusetts, who, in the Continental Congress, immediately after the Revolution, first by the voice of Rufus King, and then by the voice of Nathan Dane, insisted upon the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories.

Vote so as to vindicate those sentiments and principles of the County of Worcester, "heart of the Commonwealth," always so constantly and honorably maintained.

Vote so as to vindicate the Antislavery cause in its necessity, practicability, and dignity, and so as to confound its enemies, now banding together against it, under the lead of Mr. Thayer.

Vote so as to vindicate the existence of the Republican party, which, if the theory of Mr. Thayer be true, should at once be disbanded.

Vote, finally, so as to settle peacefully this great question, by taking it away from the chance and peril of conflict, and committing it to the calm judgment of Congress.

It is vain to say that Slavery cannot exist in the Territories under the Constitution, and therefore legislation is surperfluous. It is there in fact, and that is enough. It must be struck at once by Congress. St.

Patrick banished snakes from Ireland; but that is no reason why the woman should not bruise the head of one found there. It is vain to say, as has been said, that the slaves are few, — amounting to fourteen only in New Mexico; for human rights, whether in a vast multitude or a solitary individual, are entitled to equal and unhesitating support. In this spirit the ancient lawgiver nobly declared that to be the best government "where an injury to a single citizen is resented as an injury to the whole state." It is vain to say that the prohibition by Congress is superfluous in the present state of opinion; for nothing is clearer than the remark of Lafayette, that principles strong in themselves take new force, when solemnly recognized by all in the form of law. It is vain to say that Freedom is more powerful than Slavery, and therefore may be safely left face to face with its antagonist. In the progress of civilization, law has superseded the ordeal by battle; and law must now supersede this conflict. It is vain to say that the Territories are protected in any form, whether by the Constitution, public opinion, or the inherent strength of Freedom. No possible safeguard should be abandoned. Let there be double locks, double bolts, and double gates. No lock, no bolt, and no gate should be neglected by which Slavery may be fastened out. And, lastly, if Popular Sovereignty is invoked, let it be the Popular Sovereignty of the American people, counted by millions and assembled in Congress, rather than the tyrannical, irresponsible sovereignty of a handful of squatters.

Fellow-citizens, in taking leave of this question, I bear my testimony again to the abilities of Mr. Thayer,

and to his active labors in times past. For the good that he has done I honor him; let it all be enrolled for his benefit. But not on this account can I accept him now as a representative of our cause. It is an ancient story, consecrated by the undying verse of Homer, that a ship, with all its canvas spread, was suddenly changed into a rock at the very mouth of a frequented harbor; and thus the instrument of commerce became an impediment to commerce: —

> "Fixèd forever, a memorial stone,
> Which still may seem to sail, and *seem* alone." [1]

A similar wonder is now repeated before our eyes, making the former instrument of Freedom an impediment to Freedom. Deplore this accident we must; but the remedy is happily within our power.

[1] See Odyssey, tr. Pope, Book XIII. 180, 181.

EVENING BEFORE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

SPEECH AT FANEUIL HALL, BOSTON, NOVEMBER 5, 1860.

THIS meeting was called to order by Carlos Pierce, Esq., who announced the officers of the evening, among whom was Mr. Sumner as President. On taking the chair, he made a speech, which is preserved here as showing the anticipations of triumph at the election, and also the declared magnitude of the result. This testimony shows how seriously the election was regarded. It foreshadows change, if not revolution, — "not only a new President, but a new government."

FELLOW-CITIZENS,—Five years have now passed since it was my privilege last to set foot in Faneuil Hall. During this long, unwilling exile, whether at home or abroad, my "heart untravelled" has fondly turned to this historic place, and often have I seemed to hear those utterances for Human Rights which echo along its walls. The distant in place was confounded with the distant in time, and the accents of our own Burlingame seemed to mingle with the words of Adams, Hancock, and Warren, in the past. Let me express my gratitude that I am permitted once more to enjoy these generous utterances, no longer in dream or vision only, but in reality.

Could these venerable arches speak, what stories could they not tell, — sometimes of victory and sometimes of defeat, sometimes of gladness and sometimes of mourning, sometimes of hope and sometimes of fear! The history of American Freedom, with all its

anxieties, struggles, and triumphs, commencing before National Independence, and continued down to the very contest now about to close, — all this might be written from the voices of this Hall. But, thank God! the days of defeat, of mourning, of fear, have passed, and these walls will record only those notes of victory already beginning to sound in our ears.

There are anniversaries in our history noticed by young and old with grateful emotion; but to-morrow's sun will set on a day more glorious for Freedom than any anniversary since the fourth of July, 1776. The forces for a long time mustering are about to meet face to face; but the result is not doubtful. That Power, which, according to the boast of Slave-Masters, has governed the country for more than fifty years, — organizing cabinets and courts, directing the army and navy, controlling legislation, usurping offices, stamping its own pernicious character upon the national policy, and especially claiming all the Territories for Slavery, — that Power which has taught us by example how much of tyranny there may be in the name of Democracy, is doomed. The great clock will soon strike, sounding its knell. Every four years a new President is chosen, but rarely a new government. To-morrow we shall have not only a new President, but a new government. A new order of things will begin, and our history will proceed on a grander scale, in harmony with those sublime principles in which it commenced. Let the knell sound!

> "Ring out the old, ring in the new!
> Ring out the false, ring in the true!
> Ring out a slowly dying cause,
> And ancient forms of party strife!
> Ring in the nobler modes of life,
> With sweeter manners, purer laws!"

The eve of election is not the time for argument. Already this has been amply done in numerous public meetings, where you have been addressed by the orators of Freedom, and also in the press, which has repeated their eloquent words, while a new power, in happy harmony with the new exigencies — the "Wide-Awakes" — has shown how true it is that citizens by the million would spring forth, whenever the North

"Stamped her strong foot and said she would be free."

I need not speak of our candidate for President, whose simple, honest character has grown constantly upon the public interest, while his abilities have everywhere commanded most unhesitating respect. Nor need I speak of our candidate for Governor, whose eminent qualities alike of head and heart give assurance of a man deserving our most devoted support. Of their election there is no doubt. Abraham Lincoln will be President of the United States. John A. Andrew will be Governor of Massachusetts.

But this is not enough. Especially must you see to it, so far as depends on you, that Representatives in Congress are chosen who shall be true to the principles of the Republican party. And since the election of our President is now certain, your vote for Representatives becomes more important than your vote for President. In vain you will vote for Abraham Lincoln, if at the same time you vote for a Representative who will oppose his well-known principles. Such a vote will more than neutralize your vote for President.

Happily there is no occasion to hesitate. Boston is now represented in Congress by two eminent citizens, — differing from each other in many respects, unlike in the talents which each so largely possesses, and dis-

similar in character, and yet substantially agreeing in principles, uniting always in their votes, whether to guard Freedom or to promote the important interests of the metropolis, and by their very diversity of character, as the complement of each other, representing completely and harmoniously a large and diversified constituency. Follow the record of Mr. Burlingame and Mr. Rice, whether throughout the long contest for Speaker, or on the proposition to secure Freedom in Kansas, or on the various matters of local concern, and you will find that they always keep together.

Besides the merit of services which no candid person can question, they are also recommended by the practical consideration of their experience. They know their business, and on this account, if no other, it is for your interest that they should be continued. This experience is something which belongs to you, if you are wise enough to use it. On grounds of self-interest the most simple and obvious, you should vote for them.

But, besides experience, they will have another advantage, which you will surely not fling away. Being in harmony with the Administration, they will naturally have the ear of the President and of his Cabinet; and this alone will give them opportunities to promote the interest of Boston such as no Representative of the Opposition could hope to enjoy.

All will see how impossible it will be for Mr. Appleton and Mr. Bigelow to represent adequately this great metropolis during the coming administration. Imagine them at Washington, with the whole delegation from New England, ay, almost of the whole North, against them. Robinson Crusoe and Friday were not more solitary than these Proslavery Representatives would be

among their colleagues from the Free States. And when, on the vote for Speaker, involving the organization of the House and the arrangement of the public business, the forces of Slavery are rallied against the Northern candidate, John Sherman or William Pennington, then will the Liberty-loving citizens of Boston be mortified to find their Representatives, under specious plea of danger to the Union, ranging with Disunionists. A simple errand-boy, picked up in the streets, honest and intelligent enough to deposit a vote for a Northern Speaker, would be better than Representatives who would do this thing

The election of such persons would be a positive encouragement to the disunionists of the South. It would be a signal of sympathy from our citadel. Still further, it would be a premium for indifference to fellow-men struggling for their rights. In vain have we read the story of him who, having fallen among thieves, was succored by the good Samaritan, if we approve by our votes the conduct of those who, when Kansas had fallen among thieves and was lying wounded and bleeding, passed by on the other side without aid or sympathy.

In vain you say that these gentlemen, if elected, may mingle socially with the propagandists of Slavery at Washington, and through this intercourse promote your interests. Do not believe it. No good to you can come from any such artificial fellowship. The enmity of Slavery may be dangerous, but its friendship is fatal. None have ever escaped with honor from that deadly embrace.

In vain you appeal in the name of a party, familiarly called from its candidates Bell-Everett, which, in the recent elections of Vermont, Maine, Pennsylvania,

Ohio, and Indiana, out of more than 1,300,000 votes, polled less than 20,000, — a party which, from its lofty airs here in Boston, may remind us of Brahmins, who imagine themselves of better clay than others, or of Chinese, who imagine themselves cousins of the Sun and Moon.

Vote, then, for your present Representatives: first, to maintain the policy of the new President; secondly, as proper recognition of their merits; thirdly, that you may have the benefit of their experience; fourthly, that you may have the advantage of their friendly relations with the new Administration; fifthly, that you may help choose a Northern Speaker; sixthly, that you may answer with proper scorn the menaces of disunion, whether uttered at the South or echoed at the North.

Hereafter, fellow-citizens, let it be one of your satisfactions, that in this contest you voted for Freedom. The young man should rejoice in the privilege; the old man must take care not to lose the precious opportunity.

EVENING AFTER THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

SPEECH TO THE WIDE-AWAKES OF CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS, NOVEMBER 7, 1860.

THE "Wide-Awakes" constituted a new and powerful agency in the machinery of American politics. They were companies of active voters in uniform of cap and cape with a lamp on a staff, organized and drilled with officers, who by display in the streets increased their numbers and intensified the prevailing enthusiasm. The organization was general throughout the Northern States, and constituted the working element of the Republican party. It has been sometimes remarked that its military discipline was an unconscious preparation for the sterner duties at hand.

The companies were not disbanded immediately after the election, and at several places where Mr. Sumner lectured he received from them the compliment of a visit after the lecture. This was the case at Concord on the evening succeeding the Presidentiul election, when the Wide-Awakes of the town appeared before the house of Ralph Waldo Emerson, the admired author, where Mr. Sumner was staying, and their Captain, Hon. John S. Keyes, made the following address.

"HONORED SIR, — In behalf of the Republican Wide-Awakes of Concord, and of numerous other Republicans, part of that gallant army whose victory was yesterday achieved, I have the honor to tender to you our respectful greeting on this occasion of your first visit, after many years of pain and suffering endured in the cause of Republicanism, to the old battle-ground of Concord. We could not permit it to pass without at least offering to you a warm and earnest welcome, especially on the day following that glorious victory whose brightness no cloud obscures, and whose lustre is owing more, perhaps, to your earnest efforts in the cause of Freedom than to any other man. Permit me, Sir, in the name of these Wide-Awakes, to say to you that we trust with renewed health upon this soil you may bear forward the glorious cause of Freedom upon which our country has just entered."

Mr. Sumner, standing on the steps of the house, replied as follows.

CAPTAIN AND WIDE-AWAKES: —

YOU take me by surprise, absolutely. I am here to-night in the performance of an agreeable service outside of politics, and have not anticipated any such contingency as this with which you honor me, nor any such welcome.

I thank you, Gentlemen, for the kind and good words which have fallen from your Captain. They are a reward for the little I have been able to do in the past, and will be an encouragement in the future.

I join with you in gladness at the victory we celebrate to-day, — not of the cartridge-box, but of the ballot-box. No victories of the cartridge-box have involved higher principles or more important results than that just won by the ballot-box. A poet, whose home is in Concord, has said that the shot fired here was heard round the world. I doubt not that our victory just achieved will awaken reverberations also to be heard round the world. All men struggling for rights, vindicating liberal ideas, seeking human improvement, maintaining republican government, will be encouraged, when they hear of yesterday. It will be good news to Garibaldi in Italy, good news to the French now subjected to imperial power, good news to English Reformers, — and so also will it be good news to all among us who love Liberty, for it proclaims that at last Liberty has prevailed. Every four years we choose a new President; but it rarely happens that we choose a new government, as was done yesterday. A new order of things is inaugurated, with new auspices, lifting the Republic once more to that platform of principles on which it was originally placed by the

Fathers. What victory of the cartridge-box ever did so much?

Looking at the vote in its practical significance, several things may be considered as established and proclaimed by the American people, so that hereafter they shall not be drawn in question.

Of these I place foremost the irrevocable decree, according to the very words of Madison, that it is "wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there can be property in men,"[1] — that, therefore, Slavery, if it exists anywhere, is sectional, and must derive such life as it has from local law, and not from the Constitution, — in opposition to the pretension so often put forward in its name, that Slavery is national and Freedom sectional.

Then again the American people have declared, that all outlying Territories, so immense in extent, and destined to the support of unknown millions, shall be consecrated to Freedom, so that the vast outstretched soil shall never know the footprint of a slave: all of which is the natural conclusion and corollary from the first decree.

And yet again it is declared, that in the administration of the National Government the original policy of the Fathers shall be adopted, in opposition to the policy of Slavery, which for the last twelve years has been so tyrannical, and for the last forty years has made its barbaric impress on the country.

And still further, the decree goes forth that the Slave-Trade shall be suppressed in reality as in name, that the statutes against it shall be vigorously enforced, and the

[1] Debates in the Federal Convention, August 25, 1787: Madison Papers, Vol. III. pp. 1429, 1430.

power of the Government directed in good faith against it, all efforts to the contrary notwithstanding.

These things were yesterday proclaimed by the American people solemnly, and in a way from which there is no appeal. It was done by a vote destined to be ever memorable and a landmark of history.

Having obtained this great victory, let us study to use it with moderation, with prudence, with wisdom. Through no failure on our part must its proper fruits be lost. Happily, Abraham Lincoln [*prolonged cheers*] has those elements of character needed to carry us through the crisis. He is calm, prudent, wise, and also brave. And permit me to say, that there are moments in government when bravery is not less important than prudence. He will not see our cause sacrificed through menaces of disunion from the South, even if echoed in Massachusetts; and in this firmness he will be sustained by the American people, insisting upon all that is promised and secured by the Constitution, and to all menaces, from whatever quarter, answering back, that the Union shall be preserved and made more precious by consecration to Human Rights. [*Three cheers for the Union.*]

I thank you for this welcome, and now bid you good night.

JOY AND SORROW IN THE RECENT ELECTION.

LETTER TO THE WIDE-AWAKES OF BOSTON, AT THEIR FESTIVAL AFTER ELECTION, NOVEMBER 9, 1860.

THE defeat of Mr. Burlingame, as a Representative of Boston, which was keenly felt by Republicans, and especially by Mr. Sumner, opened the way to his wider career as Minister of the United States to China, and then as Minister of the Chinese Empire to the Western Powers. The vote stood 8,014 for Hon. William Appleton, and 7,757 for Mr. Burlingame.

BOSTON, November 9, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — An engagement out of the State will prevent me from uniting with the gallant Wide-Awakes this evening in their festival at Music Hall. But my heart will be with them in their joy and in their sorrow.

They will naturally rejoice in that great victory by which the American people have solemnly declared that *Slavery is sectional and Freedom is national*, so that, wherever Slavery exists, if it exist at all, it must be by virtue of local law, and not by virtue of the National Constitution.

But even this victory, opening a new epoch in our national history, cannot make us forget the backsliders of Boston, through whose desertion of principles the delegation in Congress, pledged to Freedom, has been weakened, and a blow struck at an eminent Representative which has fallen upon the hearts of Republicans

everywhere throughout the country. To the honor of Mr. Burlingame, all good Republicans feel wounded through him; and it is also to his honor that he was made the mark of special assault.

All experience shows that the partisans of Slavery stick at nothing, where the imagined interests of Slavery are in question. The essential brutality of Slavery showed itself lately in New York, when Marshal Rynders personally assaulted a venerable citizen who appeared at his office on public business, cursing him with most blasphemous oaths; and it showed itself here in Boston, when the supporters of Mr. Appleton for weeks traduced the Republican candidate, uttering calumnies which were as basely false with regard to him as if they had been uttered in detraction of Mr. Appleton. Such conduct must make us hate Slavery more, and add to our mortification that it prevailed among us.

It belongs to the Republican party, at last triumphant in the nation, inflexibly to sustain its principles, and also to sustain the men who are true to these principles. In this duty I doubt not it will be guided by that temperate judgment which is in harmony with the consciousness of right.

God bless the Wide-Awakes! And believe me, dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

S. B. STEBBINS, Esq.

THE VICTORY AND PRESENT DUTIES.

SPEECH TO THE WIDE-AWAKES, AT PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND, NOVEMBER 16, 1860.

LATE in the evening, after lecturing[1] in Providence, Mr. Sumner, who was the guest of Hon. A. C. Barstow, received a serenade from the Wide-Awakes, commanded by Colonel Dexter, with a band of music, and accompanied by the "Central Glee Club" and the "National Vocalists." The space in front of the house, and the streets, for some distance, were thronged. After music by the band, Mr. Sumner appeared on the front steps of the house, and addressed the immense crowd.

GENTLEMEN OF THE WIDE-AWAKES: —

I HAD supposed that with our great triumph you would naturally retire to your homes, like soldiers when peace has come. But this goodly show assures me that here in Providence you still exist as a distinct body, ready with sympathy, and I doubt not for duty also.

[1] In opening his lecture, Mr. Sumner, according to the newspaper reports, alluded to the new hall in which he spoke, called after the founder of Providence, as follows. — "In the honored name assumed for this most beautiful and spacious hall, you pledge yourselves that here Toleration shall prevail, and Liberty be a constant word. It was the gratulation of the Roman historian in the days of the good Emperors, that he could think what he pleased and speak what he thought. Should this privilege ever fail in your new hall, or anywhere within its influence, then must you forget the great example consecrated in the name of Roger Williams. With this privilege securely established, you may proudly point to a higher token of civilization than a column of the Roman Forum or a frieze of the Parthenon."

In the faithful record of recent events, the service performed by the Wide-Awakes cannot be forgotten. I see it in two different aspects. Besides contributing immensely to that victory which now gladdens our hearts, you have shown that here at the North are men ready, if the exigency requires, to leap forward in defence of Northern rights, which are only Constitutional rights. In these two things you have done well, and I am happy in this opportunity of offering you my grateful thanks.

All our hearts, fellow-citizens, are swelling with joy at the Presidential election. It is in congratulation that you appear to-night once more with banners and lights, and I rejoice with you, — as I love Liberty and love my country. It is impossible to exaggerate the result. Had we merely elected new officers, that would have been much; but we have done more. A new policy is declared. Thus far the National Government has been inspired by Slavery. It has seemed to exist for Slavery only. All is now changed. Liberty will be its inspiration. And what a change! Liberty instead of Slavery! But you know well that this change, so beneficent and natural, is in completest harmony with the Constitution and with the declared sentiments of our fathers.

I can never banish from my mind that picture of Washington taking his first oath to support the Constitution of the United States, when nowhere on the land within the national jurisdiction breathed a single slave At that time Freedom was national. Surely good men will rejoice to see our country regain once more that happy condition, nor can any person regret it who does not deliberately exalt Slavery above Free-

dom. But this condition is secured by the recent election. Already the country seems fairer, the skies clearer, the air purer, and all good influences more abundant, while Liberty opens the way to prosperity and renown. Not merely will Slavery cease its baleful predominance in the Government, but other things will be accomplished. There will be improvements in rivers and harbors, communications between the Atlantic and Pacific, homesteads for actual settlers on our public lands, peace and dignity in our foreign relations, with sympathy for struggling Liberty everywhere, also economy in administration, and reform generally, — all of which will naturally ensue, when the Republic is once more inspired by those sentiments in which it had its being.

While indulging in proper congratulations on such a victory, we can afford to disregard all menaces, from whatever quarter they come, whether from the distant South or nearer home. Conscious of right, we have only to go forward, mindful always of the Constitution, mindful also of that just moderation which adds to the strength of firmness. An ancient poet teaches, that, "where Prudence is, no Divinity is absent."[1] I cannot doubt that the Republican party, to which we belong, will be as prudent in government as it has been irresistible at the ballot-box. Such, at least, is my sincere aspiration.

Fellow-citizens and Wide-Awakes, I thank you for this unexpected visit, and now most sincerely and gratefully wish you good night.

[1] "Nullum numen abest, si sit Prudentia." — JUVENAL, *Sat.* X. 365.

The speech was followed by vocal music, in a succession of pieces, continuing till after midnight. In conclusion, the serenaders sang the following words, written by Hon. William M. Rodman.

"Bold champion of the Right!
We welcome thee to-night
With heartfelt song:
Once Freedom's tyrant foe
Essayed to lay thee low,
But now we joy to know
That thou art strong.

"Life's purpose to fulfil,
Stand thou defiant still,
While life remains:
For Thraldom's night will flee,
Our children yet shall see
The land redeemed and free
From Slavery's chains.

"Faithful and vigilant!
To thee our song we chant:
Good night! Good night!
Around thy couch be peace,
From pain may sleep release,
And strength with years increase!
Good night! Good night!"

MODERATION IN VICTORY; STANDING BY OUR PRINCIPLES.

SPEECH TO THE WIDE-AWAKES OF LOWELL, NOVEMBER 21, 1860.

IN the evening after his lecture at Lowell, Mr. Sumner was escorted by the Wide-Awakes, with banners and lights, to the house of Hon. John Nesmith, whose guest he was. On arrival there, he thanked his escort in these words: —

WIDE-AWAKES AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: —

I OWE my best thanks for the escort with which you honor me. But I must say frankly that I attribute it less to any merit of my own than to your zeal for the good cause in which I have borne a part.

In our recent triumph the Wide-Awakes have rendered conspicuous service. The light which they have carried, I trust, is symbolical of that which, under the new Administration, will be directed upon the dark places of Government, while their activity and promptitude furnish an example which all may be proud to follow.

The Republican party has prevailed. Its success is the triumph not only of Freedom, but also of the Constitution, long perverted to the purposes of Slavery. Nothing is clearer than this. The Republican party is not *aggressive*, but *conservative*. Its object is to carry

the Government back to the original policy of the Fathers. Pardon me, but I never tire of reminding my fellow-citizens, that, when Washington took his first oath as President, the Constitution nowhere on the land, within the national jurisdiction, covered a slave; and surely the Republican party cannot err, if it seeks to bring back the condition of things under Washington. Bear this in mind, if you please; and when it is said that you are aggressive, reply fearlessly, "Then is the Constitution aggressive, then was Washington aggressive." With these two authorities we cannot hesitate. To all enemies we oppose "the Constitution and Washington."

If attacks upon the Republican party here at home have caused a different impression in any quarter, the responsibility belongs to those who have constantly and systematically maligned and misrepresented us. And our severity of judgment should be reserved less for the Southern States so much excited than for those at the North who feed the flames.

Our duty is plain and bright before us, — plain as day, and bright as the sun. It is simply to proceed as we have begun, and to abide by our declared principles. This is not the moment for any surrender to threats, even if Massachusetts could ever yield to such compulsion.

It was the saying of Samuel Adams, in the early stage of our Revolution, that we should be respected abroad just in proportion to the firmness of our conduct. And this is true now. The victory which we have won can be assured only by such conduct, tempered always by that wise moderation which is needful even in victory. There should be no party act or

hasty word to increase present responsibilities. Our safety is in our principles. They are of living rock, and no power can prevail against them.

Again I thank you. Good night.

This was followed by a serenade, with a song for the occasion.

MEMORIAL STONES OF THE WASHINGTONS IN ENGLAND.

LETTER TO JARED SPARKS, HISTORIAN OF WASHINGTON, NOV. 22, 1860. FROM THE BOSTON DAILY ADVERTISER.

BOSTON, November 22, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — Since our last conversation I have received from Earl Spencer precise copies of the two "Memorial Stones" of the English family of George Washington, which I described to you as harmonizing exactly with the pedigree having the sanction of your authority.[1] The copies are, as I understand, of the same stone and of the same size with the originals, and have the original inscriptions, — being in all respects *fac-similes*. They will therefore give you an exact idea of those most interesting memorials in the parish church near Althorp, in Brington, Northamptonshire.

The largest is of Lawrence Washington, father of John Washington, who with his brother Lawrence emigrated to America. It is a slab of bluish-gray sandstone, and measures five feet nine inches long and two feet six inches broad.

This is the inscription: —

[1] Life of Washington, Appendix, pp. 510, 511: Writings, Vol. I., Appendix, pp. 552, 553.

HERE·LIETH·THE·BODI·OF·LAVRENCE
WASHINGTON · SONNE · & · HEIRE · OF
ROBERT·WASHINGTON·OF·SOVLGRÆ
IN·THE·COVNTIE·OF·NORTHAMTON
ESQVIER · WHO · MARIED · MARGARET
THE·ELDEST·DAVGHTER·OF·WILLIAM
BVTLER · OF · TEES · IN · THE · COVNTIE
OF·SVSSEXE · ESQVIER · WHO · HAD · ISSV
BY · HER · 8 · SONNS · & · 9 · DAVGHTERS
WHICH·LAVRENCE·DECESSED·THE·13
OF·DECEMBER·A: DN̂I: 1616

THOV·THAT·BY·CHANCE·OR·CHOYCE
OF·THIS·HAST·SIGHT
KNOW·LIFE·TO·DEATH·RESIGNES
AS·DAYE·TO·NIGHT
BVT·AS·THE·SVNNS·RETORNE
REVIVES·THE·DAYE
SO·CHRIST·SHALL·VS
THOVGH·TVRNDE·TO·DVST·&·CLAY

Above the inscription, carved in the stone, are the arms of the Washingtons, with the arms of the Butlers *impaled*, — the latter being, in the language of heraldry, *azure, a chevron between three covered cups or.*

The other stone is placed over Robert Washington and Elizabeth his wife. Robert was uncle of the emigrant. This is a slab of the same sandstone, and measures three feet six inches long and two feet six inches broad.

The inscription, on a small brass plate set into the stone, is as follows: —

HERE LIES INTERRED Y^E BODIES OF ELIZAB: WASHINGTON WIDDOWE, WHO CHANGED THIS LIFE FOR IMÓRTALLITIE Y^E 19^TH OF MARCH 1622. AS ALSO Y^E BODY OF ROBERT WASHINGTON GENT: HER LATE HVSBAND SECOND SONNE OF ROBERT WASHINGTON OF SOLGRAVE IN Y^E COVNTY OF NORTH: ESQ^R: WHO DEPTED THIS LIFE Y^E 10^TH OF MARCH 1622· AFTER THEY LIVED LOVINGLY TOGETHER MANY YEARES IN THIS PARRISH

On a separate brass, beneath the inscription, are the arms of the Washingtons, without any addition but a crescent, the *mark of cadency*, which denotes the *second* son. These, as you are well aware, have the combination of stars and stripes, and are sometimes supposed to have suggested our national flag. In heraldic language, they are *argent, two bars gules, in chief three mullets of the second.*

In the interesting chapter on the "Origin and Genealogy of the Washington Family," preserved in the Appendix to your "Life of Washington," it appears that Lawrence, father of the emigrant, died 13th December, and was buried at Brington 15th December, 1616. But the genealogical tables followed by you furnish no indication of the locality of this church. Had it appeared as the parish church of the Spencer family, in Northamptonshire, the locality, which I believe was unknown in our country, would have been precisely fixed.

In fact, the slab covering Lawrence Washington is in the chancel of the church, by the side of the monuments of the Spencer family. These are all in admirable preservation, with full-length effigies, busts, or other sculptured work, and exhibit an interesting and connected series of sepulchral memorials, from the reign of

Henry the Eighth to the present time. Among them is a monument by the early English sculptor, Nicholas Stone; another by Nollekens from a design by Cipriani; and another by Flaxman, with exquisitely beautiful personifications of Faith and Charity. Beneath these monuments repose successive representatives of this illustrious family, whose aristocratic claims are enhanced by services not only to the state, but also to knowledge, as shown in the unique and world-famous library collected by one of its members. In this companionship is found the last English ancestor of our Washington.

The other slab, covering Robert, uncle of the emigrant, is in one of the aisles, where it is scraped by the feet of all who pass.

The parish of Brington — written in Domesday Book "Brinintone," and also "Brintone," in modern pronunciation *Brighton* — is between seven and eight miles from the town of Northampton, not far from the centre of England. It contains about 2,210 acres, of which about 1,490 belong to Earl Spencer, and about 326 to the rector in right of his church. The soil is chiefly dark-colored loam, with a small tract of clay towards the north. Nearly four fifths of the whole is pasture.

In the village still stands the house said to have been occupied by the Washingtons when the emigrant brother left them. You will see a vignette of it on the title-page of the recent English work entitled "The Washingtons." Over the door are carved the words, THE LORD GEVETH, THE LORD TAKETH AWAY, BLESSED BE THE NAME OF THE LORD; while the Parish Register gives pathetic commentary, by showing that in the

very year when this house was built a child was born and another died in this family.

The church, originally dedicated to the Virgin, stands at the northeast angle of the village, and consists of an embattled tower with five bells, nave, north and south aisles, chancel, chapel, and modern porch. The tower is flanked by buttresses of two stages. The present fabric goes back in origin to the beginning of the fourteenth century, nearly two hundred years before the discovery of America. The chancel and chapel, where repose the Spencers and Lawrence Washington, were rebuilt by Sir John Spencer, purchaser of the estate, at the beginning of the sixteenth century. They afford a late specimen of Tudor architecture. The church is beautifully situated on the highest ground of Brington, and is surrounded by a stone wall lined with trees. Dibdin says that a more complete picture of a country churchyard is rarely seen. A well-trimmed walk encircles the whole of the interior, while the fine Gothic windows at the end of the chancel fill the scene with picturesque beauty.

The Parish Register, which is still preserved, commences in 1560. From this it appears that William Proctor was rector from 1601 to 1627, partly contemporary with the last Washingtons there. Other entries occur, relating to this family.

1616. "Mr. Lawrance Washington was buried the XVth day of December."

1620. "Mr. Philip Curtis and M^ls^ Amy Washington were maried August 8."

1622. "Mr. Robert Washington was buried March y^e^ 11th."

——. "M^rs^ Elisabeth Washington widow was buried March y^e^ 20th."

Of a minister in this church we have an amusing notice in Evelyn's Memoirs, where the following contrast is found, under date of August 18th, 1688: "Dr. Jeffryes [a misnomer for *Jessop*], the minister of Althorp, who was my Lord's chaplain when Ambassador in France, *preached the shortest discourse I ever heard;* but what was defective in the amplitude of his sermon he had supplied in the largeness and convenience of the parsonage-house."[1]

Less than a mile from the church is the famous seat of the Spencers, surrounded by a park of five hundred acres, with one of the gates opening near the church. Bordering on the churchyard are oak-trees which were growing at the purchase of the estate in the reign of Henry the Seventh. Evelyn was often here, a delighted visitor. On one occasion he speaks of "the house, or rather palace, at Althorp."[2] Elsewhere he describes it as "in a pretty open bottom, very finely watered, and flanked with stately woods and groves in a park."[3] An engraving by the younger Luke Vorsterman, a Dutch artist, attests the attraction of the place at this time.

One feature of the park excited the admiration of Evelyn, and at a later day of Mrs. Jameson, who gives to it some beautiful pages in her "Visits and Sketches at Home and Abroad." It is a record of the dates when different plantations of trees were begun. While recommending this practice in his "Sylva," Evelyn remarks, "The only instance I know of the like in our own country is in the park at Althorp in Northamptonshire, the magnificent seat of the Right Hon. the Earl of Sunderland."[4] Here are six of these commemorative

[1] Vol. I. p. 652. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., p. 478.
[4] Sylva, ed. Hunter, (York, 1776,) p. 497.

stones. The first records a wood planted by Sir John Spencer, in 1567 and 1568; the second, a wood planted by Sir John Spencer, son of the former, in 1589; the third, a wood planted by Robert Lord Spencer, in 1602 and 1603; the fourth, a wood planted by Sir William Spencer, Knight of the Bath, afterwards Lord Spencer, in 1624. This stone is ornamented with the arms of the Spencers, and on the back is inscribed, VP AND BEE DOING AND GOD WILL PROSPER. In this scenery and amidst these associations the Washingtons lived. When the emigrant left, in 1657, the woods must have been well grown. Not long afterwards they arrested the attention of Evelyn. The fifth and sixth stones were never seen by the Washingtons, or by Evelyn. They were set up in 1798 and 1800, by George John, second Earl Spencer, who planted trees as well as amassed books.

The Household Books at Althorp show that for many years the Washingtons were frequent guests. The hospitality of this seat has been renowned. The Queen of James the First and Prince Henry, on their way to London in 1603, were welcomed there in an entertainment, memorable for a Masque from the vigorous muse of Ben Jonson.[1] Charles the First was at Althorp in 1647, when he received the first intelligence of those approaching pursuers from whom he never escaped except by the scaffold. In 1695, King William was there for a week, and, according to Evelyn, "mightily entertained."[2] At least one of the family was famous for hospitality of a different character. Evelyn records that he used to dine with the Countess of Sunderland, — the

[1] The Satyr: Works, ed. Gifford, (London, 1816,) Vol. VI. p. 468.
[2] Memoirs, Vol. II. p. 50.

title then borne by the Spencers, — when she invited *fire-eaters*,[1] stone-eaters, and opera-singers, after the fashion of the day.[2]

The family was early and constantly associated with literature. Spenser, the poet, belonged to it, and dedicated to one of its members, Alice Spencer, "the Ladie Strange," afterwards Countess of Derby, his "Tears of the Muses." For the same Alice Spencer Milton wrote his "Arcades," while Sir John Harrington celebrated her memory by an epigram. The Sacharissa of Waller was the Lady Dorothy Sydney, wife of the first Earl of Sunderland, third Lord Spencer, who perished fighting for King Charles the First at Newbury. I do not dwell on other associations of a later day, as my object is simply to indicate those which existed in the time of the Washingtons.

"The nobility of the Spencers has been illustrated and enriched by the trophies of Marlborough; but I exhort them to consider the 'Fairy Queen' as the most precious jewel of their coronet." Thus wrote Gibbon in his Memoirs,[3] and all must feel the beauty of the exhortation. This nobility may claim another illustration from ties of friendship and neighborhood with the Washingtons. Perhaps hereafter our countrymen will turn aside from their travels to visit the parish church of Brington, in reverence for a spot so closely associated with American history.

I trust that this little sketch, suggested by what I saw at Althorp during a brief visit last autumn, will

[1] At the date of Mr. Sumner's letter the extremists of Slavery in our country were known as "fire-eaters."

[2] Memoirs, Vol. I. pp. 458, 488, 579.

[3] Introduction, p. 4, ed. Milman, London, 1889.

not seem irrelevant. Besides my own personal impressions and the volumes quoted, I have relied upon Dibdin's "Ædes Althorpianæ," so interesting to all bibliographical students, and especially upon Baker's "History and Antiquities of the County of Northampton," — one of those magnificent local works which illustrate English history, — to which you refer in your Appendix.

The Memorial Stones, which I have received from Lord Spencer, are of historic value; and I think that I shall best carry out the generous idea of the giver by taking care that they are permanently placed where they can be seen by the public, — perhaps in the State-House, near Chantrey's beautiful statue of Washington, if this should be agreeable to the Commonwealth.

Pray pardon this call upon your attention, and believe me, my dear Sir, with much regard,

Ever sincerely yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

JARED SPARKS, Esq.

The following official documents show how these Memorial Stones found their way to the State-House of Massachusetts.

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, COUNCIL CHAMBER,
BOSTON, March 15, 1861.

"*To the Honorable the House of Representatives:* —

"I have the honor to present to the General Court, as a gift to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from one of its citizens, certain memorials of great historic interest.

"The home and final resting-place of the ancestors of George Washington were until recently unvisited by and unknown to Americans. In the genealogical table appended to the 'Life of Washington' by our distinguished fellow-citizen, Mr. Jared Sparks, it is stated that

Lawrence Washington, the father of John Washington (who emigrated to Virginia in 1657), was buried at Brington; but, though both Mr. Sparks and Washington Irving visited Sulgrave, an earlier home of the Washingtons, neither of these learned biographers appears by his works to have repaired to this quiet parish in Northamptonshire.

"Our fellow-citizen, the Hon. Charles Sumner, on a recent visit to England, identified certain inscriptions in the parish church of Brington, near Althorp, as being those of the father and uncle of John Washington, the emigrant to Virginia, who was the great-grandfather of the Father of his Country.

"Earl Spencer, the proprietor of Althorp, sought out the quarry from which, more than two centuries ago, these tablets were taken, and caused others to be made which are exact *fac-similes* of the originals. These he has presented to Mr. Sumner, who has expressed the desire that memorials so interesting to all Americans may be placed where they may be seen by the public, and has authorized me to offer them to the Commonwealth, if it be the pleasure of the Legislature to order them to be preserved in some public part of the State-House.

"I send with this a letter addressed to myself by the learned historian of Washington, bearing testimony to the great interest of these memorials, and expressing the desire that they may (Mr. Sumner assenting) be placed in the Capitol.

"A letter from Mr. Sumner to Mr. Sparks also accompanies this Message, describing the church at Brington, and some of the associations which cluster around the resting-place of the ancestors of our Washington.

"JOHN A. ANDREW."

MR. SPARKS TO THE GOVERNOR.

"CAMBRIDGE, February 22, 1861.

"DEAR SIR, — I enclose a copy of a highly interesting letter from Mr. Charles Sumner, describing the church at Brington, near Althorp, in Northamptonshire. In this church were deposited the remains of Lawrence Washington, who was the father of John and Lawrence Washington, the emigrants to America, and who was therefore the last English ancestor of George Washington. A copy of the inscription on the stone which covers the grave of Lawrence Washington, and also of another inscription over the grave of his brother, Robert Washington, who was buried in the same church, are given with exactness in Mr. Sumner's letter. As far as I am aware, these inscriptions are now for the first time made known in this country.

"Earl Spencer has sent to Mr. Sumner two stones, being from the same quarry, and having the same form and dimensions, as the originals, and containing a *fac-simile* of the inscriptions. It has been suggested that these stones ought to be placed in the State-House, where they may be accessible to the public, and my opinion on the subject has been asked. As they are unquestionably genuine memorials of the Washington family, and possess on this account a singular historical interest, I cannot imagine that a more appopriate disposition of them could be made. I understand that Mr. Sumner would cheerfully assent to such an arrangement, and I cannot doubt that your Excellency will be well inclined to take such measures as may effectually aid in attaining so desirable an object.

"I am, Sir, very respectfully yours,

"JARED SPARKS.

"His Excellency JOHN A. ANDREW,
Governor of Massachusetts."

"COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, March 23, 1861.

"The Committee on the State-House, to whom was referred the Message of His Excellency the Governor, presenting to the General Court, as a gift from the Hon. Charles Sumner, certain memorials of Washington, of great historic interest, report that they consider it a matter of special congratulation that the interesting facts concerning the Father of his Country, contained in the papers accompanying the Message, should have been first made known to us by a citizen of Massachusetts; and deeming it important that these valuable memorials should be permanently preserved in the capitol of the State, they report the accompanying resolves.

"Per order,

"R. WARD."

"*Resolves in relation to certain Memorials of the Ancestors of Washington.*

"*Resolved,* That the thanks of the General Court be and hereby are presented to the Hon. Charles Sumner for his interesting and patriotic gift to the Commonwealth, of two Memorial Tablets in imitation of the originals which mark the final resting-place of the last English ancestors of GEORGE WASHINGTON.

"*Resolved*, That the Commissioners on the State-House cause the same to be prepared and placed, with appropriate inscriptions, in some convenient place in the Doric Hall of the State-House, near the statue of Washington. — *Approved April* 6, 1861."

"OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS ON THE STATE-HOUSE,
BOSTON, January 1, 1862.

"The undersigned, Commissioners on the State-House, hereby certify, that, in compliance with the Resolves of the Legislature of Massachusetts, passed April 6, 1861, they have caused the abovenamed Memorial Tablets of the Washington Family to be permanently placed upon the marble floor of the area in which the statue of Washington stands, within the railing in front of said statue.

"JOHN MORISSEY, *Sergeant-at-Arms.*
OLIVER WARNER, *Secretary.*
HENRY K. OLIVER, *Treasurer.*"

A white marble tablet, placed by the Commissioners near the Washington Memorials, bears the following inscription: —

THESE FAC-SIMILES OF THE MEMORIAL STONES OF THE WASHINGTON FAMILY IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF BRINGTON, THE BURIAL-PLACE OF THE SPENCERS, NEAR ALTHORP, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE, ENGLAND, WERE PRESENTED BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE EARL SPENCER TO CHARLES SUMNER OF MASSACHUSETTS, AND BY HIM OFFERED TO THE COMMONWEALTH 22 FEBRUARY, 1861.

LAWRENCE WAS FATHER, AND ROBERT UNCLE, OF THE ENGLISH EMIGRANT TO VIRGINIA, WHO WAS GREAT-GRANDFATHER OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

LAFAYETTE, THE FAITHFUL ONE.

ADDRESS AT THE COOPER INSTITUTE, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 30, 1860.

He [Algernon Sidney] was stiff to all republican principles, and such an enemy to everything that looked like monarchy, that he set himself in a high opposition against Cromwell, when he was made Protector. — BURNET, *History of His Own Time*, Vol. I. p. 538.

Quant à moi, j'avoue que mon indolence sur cet objet tient à la confiance intime où je suis que la liberté finira par s'établir dans l'ancien monde comme dans le nouveau, et qu'alors l'histoire de nos révolutions mettra chaque chose et chacun à sa place. — LAFAYETTE, *Mémoires*, Tom. I. Avant-propos, p. v.

Go on, my friend, in your consistent and magnanimous career; and may you live to witness and enjoy the success of a cause the most truly glorious that can animate the breast of man, — that of elevating and meliorating the condition of his race. — JAMES MADISON, *Letter to Lafayette*, 1821: *Letters and other Writings*, Vol. III. pp. 237, 238.

THIS Address was at the invitation of the Young Men's Republican Union of New York, before whom the speech on the Republican party had been given.[1] On the present occasion, William C. Bryant, justly famous in our literature, took the chair and introduced Mr. Sumner in the following words.

"I am glad, my friends, to see so large an audience assembled for the purpose of hearing one of our most accomplished scholars and orators discourse on a subject lying apart from the ordinary strifes and immediate interests of the day. Concerning the services rendered by Lafayette to our country, to our own Republic, in the most critical stage of its existence, there is no controversy. For them we are all grateful. For his personal character we all cherish a high veneration. And your presence here to-night in such numbers declares that there are multitudes among us who cherish and preserve a warm admiration, a generous and purifying enthusiasm, for the noble examples of self-sacrifice bequeathed to us by a generation which has passed away. Among public men, in all times and all countries, among all that class who have been actors in the events which make up the history of the world, there are few, unfortunately, who can compare with Lafayette in a course of steady, unswerving virtue. Attend, then, my friends, to the portraiture of that virtue drawn and set before you in living words by a great artist, Charles Sumner, of Boston, whom I now introduce to this assembly." [*Long continued cheering.*]

The newspapers speak of the assembly as crowded and enthusiastic, in spite of stormy weather. The *Herald* says, "The cheering was protracted, and the utmost enthusiasm was manifested by the audience." Even the *World* adds, "The lecturer was frequently and vociferously applauded, and the audience gave evidence of deep interest in his remarks." From the report in the *Herald* it appears that the allusions to Slavery were received always with "applause," while, at the remark of Lafayette attributing "the evils of France less to the madness of violence than to compromise of conscience by timid men,"[2] there was what the *Herald* calls "vehement and long continued applause, and waving of hats and handkerchiefs." The temper of the audience was an illustration of prevailing sentiment.

Beside the newspaper report at the time, this address was printed at

[1] The Republican Party, its Origin, Necessity, and Permanence: *Ante*, pp. 191-229

[2] See, *post*, p 420.

New York in a pamphlet, but from notes of reporters without revision or help from Mr. Sumner.

In selecting this subject, Mr. Sumner was governed by two considerations: first, a long cherished desire to pay the homage justly due in his opinion to an illustrious character whose place in history was not yet determined, and, secondly, the conviction, that, in the actual crisis of our affairs, such an example of fidelity would help to fix popular sentiment. The sympathy of the audience in all the testimony against Slavery, and especially in the condemnation of Compromise, showed that the effort was appreciated. The report in the *Herald* was headed "*Sumner on Slavery.*"

Rumors of compromise in certain quarters and menaces from the South increased the anxiety of the more earnest to take advantage of every opportunity for demonstration against Slavery. To all suggestions of concession the North made haste to answer in the negative. Already began that fidelity under which the Rebellion finally succumbed and Slavery disappeared.

Mr. Sumner was especially pleased at the appreciation of this Address as an effort against compromise, — shown by a letter from a citizen of Kansas, who was present: —

"How timely and impressively that bright example teaches adherence to Liberty and Principle, and resistance to concession and compromise, at the present crisis!"

A patriot citizen who heard it at Philadelphia, where it was given before an immense audience, wrote: —

"Your Lecture has done more good than words can tell. There is no such thing as calculating its value to our city."

The *Pennsylvanian* of Philadelphia, after entitling it "Clear Grit Abolitionism," said: —

"The People's Literary Institute Lecture, at Concert Hall, last evening, was by that perfect ensample of Abolitionism, Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts. The hall was crowded, negroes occupying the front seats and other prominent places. Sumner's nominal subject was 'Lafayette,' but he made his sketch of the noble Marquis a vehicle for the expression of the most ardent wishes and aspirations after negro equality. The audience applauded the most radical passages, although a stray hiss now and then betrayed the whereabouts of a 'Conservative.'"

ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT, — I am to speak this evening of one who early consecrated himself to Human Rights, and throughout a long life became their representative, knight-errant, champion, hero, missionary, apostle, — who strove in this cause as no man in history has ever striven, — who suffered for it as few have suffered, — and whose protracted career, beginning at an age when others are yet at school, and continued to the tomb, where he tardily arrived, is conspicuous for the rarest fidelity, the purest principle, and the most chivalrous courage, whether civil or military. There is but one personage to whom this description is justly applicable, and you have anticipated me when I pronounce the name of Lafayette. As in Germany Jean Paul is known as "the Only One," so would I hail Lafayette as "the Faithful One." If Liberty be what philosophy, poetry, and the human heart all declare, then must we treasure the example of one who served her always with a lover's fondness and with a martyr's constancy, nor demand perfections which do not belong to human nature. It is enough for unstinted gratitude that he stood forth her steadfast friend, like the good angel, —

"unmoved,
Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified, —

trampling on all the blandishments of youth, of fortune, and of power, keeping himself sternly aloof whether from King or Emperor, and always insisting upon the same comprehensive cause, — with a soul as fearless and irreproachable as Bayard, from whom generals and kings received knighthood, as unbending as Cato, who singly stood out against Cæsar, and as gentle as that best loved disciple, who leaned on the bosom of the Saviour, and alone of all the Twelve followed him to the Cross.

If anything could add to the interest which this unparalleled career is calculated to awaken, I should find it in special associations which I have enjoyed. Often, when in Paris halting about as an invalid, I turned from its crowded life to visit the simple tomb of Lafayette in the conventual cemetery of Picpus, watched by white-hooded nuns, within the circle of the old walls, where he lies by the side of his heroic wife, pattern of noblest womanhood. Gazing on this horizontal slab of red freestone, in shape like that of Albert Dürer in the republican graveyard of Nuremberg, bearing an inscription without title of any kind, and then casting my eyes upon the neighboring monuments, where every name has the blazon of prince or noble, I seemed to see before me that youthful, life-long, and incomparable loyalty to a great cause with perfect consistency to the end, marking him a phenomenon of history, which will be my theme to-night. The interest inspired at the republican tomb was strengthened at Lagrange, the country home of Lafayette, a possession derived from the family of his wife, where he passed the last thirty years of life in patriarchal simplicity, sur-

rounded by children and grandchildren, with happy guests, and where everything still bears witness to him.

Nor do I believe that my interest goes far beyond that of the American people, when I think how his name is a household word, dear to all alike, old and young. Even the list of post-offices in the United States shows no less than fifty with his venerated name, and eighteen with the name of Lagrange.

Just before leaving France, now a year ago, on a clear and lovely day of October, in company with a friend, I visited this famous seat, which at once reminded me of the prints of it so common at shop-windows in my childhood. It is a picturesque and venerable castle, with five round towers, a moat, a drawbridge, an arched gateway, ivy-clad walls, and a large court-yard within, embosomed in trees, except on one side, where a beautiful lawn spreads its verdure. Everything speaks to us. The castle itself is of immemorial antiquity, — supposed to have been built in the earliest days of the French monarchy, as far back as Louis le Gros. It had been tenanted by princes of Lorraine, and been battered by the cannon of Turenne, one of whose balls penetrated its thick masonry. The ivy so luxuriantly mantling the gate, with the tower by its side, was planted by the eminent British statesman, Charles Fox, on a visit during the brief peace of Amiens. The park owed much of its beauty to Lafayette himself. The situation harmonized with the retired habits which found shelter there from the storms of fortune. It is in the level district of Brie, famous for its cheese, and forming part of the province of Champagne, famous for its wine, — about forty-five miles to the east of Paris, remote from

any high-road, and at some distance from the railway recently opened through the neighborhood, in a country rich with orchards and smiling with fertility of all kinds. The estate immediately about the castle contains six hundred acres, which in the time of Lafayette was enlarged by several outlying farms. The well-filled library occupied an upper room in one of the towers, and near a window overlooking the farm-yard still stood the desk at which Lafayette was in the habit of sitting, with the speaking-trumpet by which he made himself heard in the yard, and with the account-book of the farm lying open as he had left it. All about were souvenirs of our country, showing how it engaged his thoughts. The castle is now occupied by the family of one of his grandchildren, whose hospitable welcome to us as Americans gave token of their illustrious ancestor, hardly less than these precious memorials and the full-length portrait by Ary Scheffer which looked down from the walls.

And now holding up to view a model of surpassing fidelity in support of Human Rights, I am not without hope that others may see the beauty of such a character and try to make it in some measure their own. There is need of it among us. We, too, must be faithful.

Gilbert de Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, only child of an ancient house, was born 6th September, 1757, at the castle of Chavaniac, in the central and mountainous province of Auvergne, in France. He came into the world an orphan, — for his father, a colonel of grenadiers in the French army, had already perished at the Battle of Minden. The verses which once interested Burns

and excited the youthful admiration of Scott, though suggested by a humbler lot, depict some of the circumstances which surrounded his: —

> "Cold on Canadian hills or *Minden's plain*,
> Perhaps that parent mourned her soldier slain,
> Bent o'er her babe, her eye dissolved in dew,
> The big drops mingling with the milk he drew." [1]

The mother died soon after, leaving her child alone in the world, with rank and fortune such as few possess.

In the Memoirs, written by his own hand, Lafayette mentions simply his birth, without allusion to family or ancestry. This was characteristic of one who had so completely renounced all such distinctions. But the temptations he overcame and the prejudices he encountered can be fully appreciated only when we know his origin. His family was not merely ancient and noble, but for generations historic. It had given to French renown a Marshal, who, after honorable service in Italian campaigns, fought by the side of the Maid of Orléans in the expulsion of the English from France; and it had added to the more refined glories of the nation an authoress of that name, the friend of Rochefoucauld and Madame de Sévigné, who shone by literary genius at the court of Louis the Fourteenth, and became an early example of what woman may accomplish: so that the young orphan bore a name which, in a land of hereditary distinctions, seemed to enlist him for their conservation, while it gave him everywhere an all-sufficient passport.

But as some are born poets and others are born mathematicians, the Marquis de Lafayette was born

[1] Langhorne, The Country Justice, Part I. 161–164. See also Lockhart's Life of Scott, Vol. I. ch. 5.

with instinctive fidelity to the great principles of Liberty and Equality, by the side of which all hereditary distinctions disappear. Liberty, he had the habit of saying, was with him a religion, a love, and a geometrical certainty; and this passion, thus sacred, ardent, and confident, was inborn, perpetual, and irresistible. While still a child in the seclusion of Auvergne, he sighed for dangerous adventure, and when at the age of eleven he was transferred to college at Paris, the soul of the young noble responded instinctively to all instances of republican virtue. In the child may be seen the man, and he delighted afterwards to remember that during those early years, when the heart showed itself as it was, in a school exercise describing "the perfect horse," he lost the prize by picturing the noble animal as throwing his rider at sight of the whip. Nor did his ardent nature express itself in superficial sallies. At every period of life, and particularly in youth, he was grave and silent even to coldness, — thus in external manner differing from the giddy and ostentatious nobles of his day, as he contrasted with them in character.

An early marriage, at the age of sixteen, with the remarkable daughter of the ducal house of Noailles, enlarged his aristocratic connections, and completed all that heart could desire for happiness or worldly advancement. But the life of a courtier, even with the companionship of royal princes, did not satisfy his earnest nature, and he turned away from the grandeurs and follies of Versailles to follow in the steps of his father as captain in the French army. Stationed at Metz, a border fortification on the Rhenish frontier of France, an incident occurred which gave impulse and direction to his life.

The Duke of Gloucester, brother of King George the Third, smarting under slights at court on account of a marriage disagreeable to the King, turned his back upon England, and in his travels stopped at Metz, where he was welcomed at dinner by the commander of the garrison. At that table sat the youthful Lafayette, only nineteen years old, who there for the first time heard the story of the American "insurgents," as they were called, — of their armed resistance to British troops, and of the Declaration of Independence. His whole nature was thrilled, and the passionate declamation against arbitrary power to which the English Duke gave vent, though stirred only by wounded pride and spite, fell like a spark upon his sincere and sensitive soul, already kindling with generous emotions, so that, before the dinner was ended, his resolution was fixed to cross the ocean and offer his sword to distant, unknown fellow-men struggling for liberty. This was in the autumn of 1776.[1] Hastening back to Paris, he lost no time in engaging with the American Commissioners there, who with grateful astonishment welcomed their romantic ally.

Meanwhile came tidings of melancholy reverses which followed the Declaration of Independence, and of the scanty forces of Washington tracking the snow with bloody feet, as they retreated through New Jersey, — seeming to announce that all was lost. The American Commissioners frankly confessed that they could not encourage Lafayette to proceed with his purpose. But his undaunted temper was quickened anew, and when

[1] Grahame, History of the United States, Book XI. ch. 5. Writings of Washington, ed. Sparks, Vol. V., Appendix, No. 1. Mémoires, Correspondance et Manuscrits du Général Lafayette, publiés par sa Famille, Tom. I. pp. 9, 10, note.

they told him that with their damaged credit it was impossible to provide a vessel for his conveyance, he exclaimed: "Thus far you have seen my zeal only; now it shall be something more. I will purchase and equip a vessel myself. It is while danger presses that I wish to join your fortunes." Noble words, worthy of immortality, and never to be heard without a throb by an American heart!

Before embarking, Lafayette, partly to mask his enterprise, and also in the hardihood of courage, visited England, where his wife's uncle, the French ambassador, presented him to George the Third, who, unconscious of his purpose, said, "I hope you mean to stay some time in Britain"; to which he answered, that it was not in his power. "What obliges you to leave us?" asked the King. "Please your Majesty," said our new ally, "I have a very particular engagement; and if your Majesty were aware of it, you would not desire me to stay." During this visit everything was open to the youthful soldier, and he was even invited to attend the review of British troops about to embark for America. From instinctive delicacy he declined, thinking it not right to take advantage of a hospitable invitation to inspect troops against whom he was about to array himself in war. "But," he added, in relating this incident, "I met them six months after at the Brandywine."

Quitting England, he traversed France with secrecy and despatch to join his vessel, which was at a Spanish port, beyond French jurisdiction. His departure came like a bolt upon the English Court, which he had just left, also upon the French Court, which was not yet prepared for a break with England, and upon his most affectionate family, who were planning for him a tour

in Italy, which in his busy life he never made; but his young wife, who suffered most, loved him too well not to partake his sentiments and to approve his generous resolution, even though it separated him from her. To illustrate the general sensation, I quote the words of the historian Gibbon, in a letter dated April 12, 1777. "We talk chiefly of the Marquis de Lafayette, who was here a few weeks ago. He is about twenty, with an hundred and thirty thousand livres a year, the nephew of Noailles, who is ambassador here. He has bought the Duke of Kingston's yacht, and is gone to join the Americans."[1] His family interfered by peremptory command, and the French Government interfered by that arbitrary mandate, under seal of the King, known as *lettre-de-cachet*, — but, disregarding the one and evading the other, in the disguise of a courier, our devoted ally traversed the Pyrenees, and soon found himself with his companions in arms on board his vessel, which, on the 26th of April, 1777, set sail for America.

Undertaking this enterprise at a time when the sea and all beyond were little known, the youthful adventurer showed a heart of "triple oak." Our admiration is enhanced, when we recall the charms of country, rank, and family left behind, — with perils of capture and war braved even before reaching the land, — and especially when we contemplate the motive in which this enterprise had its origin. Rarely has hero gone forth on so beautiful an errand; for he carried words of cheer to our fathers, then in despairing struggle for the Great Declaration, and opened the way for those fleets and armies of France soon after marshalled on our side;

[1] Letter to J. Holroyd, Esq.: Miscellaneous Works, ed. Lord Sheffield, (London, 1814,) Vol. II. p. 197.

nor is it too much to say, that he was the good angel of Independence. His family correspondence, which has seen the light only since his death, exhibits his beautiful fidelity and the completeness of his dedication to our cause. In a letter to his distinguished father-in-law, announcing his purpose, he says of American interests, that they "will always be more dear to him than his own," and then declares himself "at the height of joy at having found so fine an occasion to do something and to improve himself." [1] In a letter to his wife, written on the voyage, under date of June 7, 1777, his sympathy with the great objects of the national contest is tenderly revealed. "I hope, for my sake," he writes, in words worthy of everlasting memory, "that you will become a good American. This is a sentiment proper for virtuous hearts. Intimately allied to the happiness of the whole Human Family is that of America, destined to become the respectable and sure asylum of virtue, honesty, toleration, equality, and of a tranquil liberty." [2] Where are nobler words of aspiration for our country than this simple testimony by a youth of nineteen, pouring out his heart to his wife of seventeen? Where in history are grander words from youth or man? For seven weeks laboring through the sea, yet sustained by thoughts like these, he arrived at last on the coast of South Carolina. It was dark, but, pushing ashore in a boat, and following the guidance of a light, he found himself under a friendly roof. His first word, as he touched the land, was a vow to conquer or perish with it.

The Continental Congress was then sitting at Philadelphia, and, without stopping for rest, the sea-worn

[1] Lettre au Duc d'Ayen, 9 Mars, 1777: Mémoires, Tom. I. p. 88.
[2] Ibid., p. 89.

voyager hastened to report himself there. Most of the way on horseback, for nine hundred miles, he journeyed on, enjoying the country in its native freshness, and the simple, cordial welcome which greeted him everywhere on the road. "The further North I advance," thus he wrote to his wife, "the more I like this country and its people."[1] He had already been struck by what to him were "black domestics who came to ask his orders."[2] Then for the first time he looked upon a slave. His well-known sentiments, so constantly declared, show clearly how his candid nature must have been troubled. He had forsaken France, where, amidst gross inequalities of condition, this grossest was unknown, — where, in the descending ranks of the feudal hierarchy, there was no place for this degradation, — where, amidst unjust taxes and injurious privileges without number, every man had a right at least to his child, to his wife, and to himself, — and where the boast went forth, as in England, and was repeated by judicial tribunals, that the air was too pure for a slave. With heavenly generosity he had turned away from his own country to help the cause of Freedom in another hemisphere, and here he found man despoiled of all *personal* rights, and even degraded to be property, by those whose own struggles merely for *political* rights had thrilled the fibres of his being. Youthful, and little schooled as yet in the world, he must have recoiled instinctively, as this most dismal and incomprehensible inconsistency appeared before him. How faithfully he battled with the demon his life will show.

Arrived in Philadelphia, he announced that he had

[1] Letter of 17th July, 1777: Mémoires, Tom. I. p. 98.
[2] Ibid., p. 16, note.

come to serve at his own expense and as volunteer. The Continental Congress, touched by the magnanimous devotion of the youthful stranger, and apprised of his distinguished connections at home, appointed him without delay Major-General in the army of the United States, where he took rank by the side of Gates and Greene, Lincoln and Lee. Born to exalted condition in an ancient monarchy, he found himself welcomed to the highest place in the military councils of a struggling republic, and this while still a youth under twenty,— younger than Fox, younger than Pitt, when they astonished the world by their precocious parliamentary powers, — younger than Condé, in his own beautiful France, on the field of Rocroi. And his modesty was not less eminent than his post. To Washington, who made apologies for exhibiting his troops before a French officer, he replied with interesting simplicity, "I have come to learn, and not to teach."[1] The Commander-in-Chief, usually so grave, was won at once to that perpetual friendship which endured unbroken as long as life,— showing itself now in tears of joy and then in tears of grief, — watching the youthful stranger with paternal care, — sharing with him table, tent, and on the field of Monmouth the same cloak for a couch, — following his transcendent fortunes, now on giddiest heights and then in gloom, with constant, unabated attachment, — corresponding with him at all times, — addressing him in terms of unwonted endearment as "the man he loved,"[2] and saying again that he "had not words to express his affection, were he to attempt it,"[3] — sending kindly

[1] Mémoires, Tom. I. p. 21.

[2] Letter of January 4, 1782: Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. VIII. p. 225.

[3] Letter of December 8, 1784: Ibid., Vol. IX. p. 78. See also Mémoires, Tom. I. p. 62, note.

sympathy to that devoted wife in her unparalleled affliction, and pleading across sea and continent with the Austrian despot for his release from the dungeons of Olmütz.

It is much to have inspired the most tender friendship which history records in the life of Washington. There were with us other strangers, scarcely less brilliant than Lafayette. There was Kosciusko, the Pole, who afterwards played so great a part in his own country, — Steuben, the German, who did so much for the discipline of our troops, — De Kalb, the gallant soldier, who died for us at Camden, — Rochambeau, the distinguished commander of the French forces, compeer with Washington at Yorktown, — Lauzun, the sparkling courtier, whose fascinations were acknowledged by Marie Antoinette, — Ségur, the high-bred youthful soldier and future diplomatist, — Montesquieu, grandson of the immortal author of the "Spirit of Laws," — Saint-Simon, whose military and ancestral honors are now lost in his fame as social reformer, — also the unfortunate Count de Loménie, with the Prince de Broglie of the old monarchy, and Berthier, afterwards a prince of the Empire. All these were in our revolutionary contest gathered about Washington; but Lafayette alone obtained place in his heart. Friendship is always a solace and delight; but such a friendship was a testimony. Let it ever be said that Washington chose Lafayette as friend, while Lafayette was to him always pupil, disciple, son.

His intrepidity found early occasion for display at the Battle of the Brandywine, where, attempting to rally our unlucky troops, he was severely wounded in the leg, and thus at once, by suffering for us, increased his

titles to regard. As he became known, his simple and bountiful nature awakened the attachment of officers and men, so that in writing to his wife he was able to relieve her anxieties by saying that he had "the friendship of the army in gross and in detail," and also what he calls "a tender union with the most respectable, the most admirable of men, General Washington."[1] Nor was this unnatural, when we consider how completely he became American in dress, food, and habits, as he was already American in heart. Avoiding no privation or fatigue, this juvenile patrician, educated to indulgence in all the forms that wealth and privilege could supply, showed himself more frugal and more austere even than his republican associates, living sometimes for months on a single ration. The confidence of Congress soon followed, and by special resolution Washington was requested to place him at the head of an independent command.

Meanwhile France openly enlisted on our side. Turgot, the philosopher, and Necker, the financier, counselled, as far-sighted ministers, against this step, which launched the ancient monarchy in a dangerous career. Jealous of a rival power, smarting under recent reverses, and brooding over the accumulated rancors of long generations, the Court was willing to embarrass England, yet covertly and without the hazard of open war. The King himself never sympathized with the American cause. But public opinion, which in that nation inclines to generous ideas, was moved by the news of a distant people waging a contest for Human Rights, at first doubtful, and then suddenly illumined by the victory of Saratoga, — while Franklin, the philosopher

[1] Letter of 6th November, 1777: Mémoires, Tom. I. p. 119. See also p. 133.

and diplomatist, our unequalled representative at Paris, challenged the admiration alike of grave and gay, and the example of Lafayette touched the heart of France. These wrought so far, that Court and King were obliged to bend before the popular will, and then came the Treaty of Alliance with the Colonies by which their place in the Family of Nations was assured. The Treaty was communicated to the British Court, with a note referring Independence to the Declaration of the 4th of July, on which Lafayette, with constant instinct for popular rights, exclaimed, "Here is a principle of national sovereignty which will some day be recalled at home."[1] Of course, if Americans could become independent by a Declaration, so could Frenchmen.

The duties of Frenchman were now superadded to the duties Lafayette had assumed toward our cause. "As long," said he, in a letter to Congress, "as I thought I could dispose of myself, I made it my pride and pleasure to fight under American colors in defence of a cause which I dare more particularly call *ours* because I had the good luck to bleed for it. Now that France is involved in a war, I am urged by a sense of duty, as well as by patriotic love, to present myself before the King, and know in what manner he judges proper to employ my services. The most agreeable of all will always be such as may enable me to serve the common cause among those whose friendship I have had the happiness to obtain, and whose fortune I have had the honor to follow in less smiling times." Congress responded by unlimited leave of absence, with permission to return at his own convenient time, and by a vote of grateful thanks and a sword, together with a

[1] Mémoires, Tom. I. p. 78.

letter to the French King, where they said, "We recommend this young nobleman to your Majesty's notice, as one whom we know to be wise in council, gallant in the field, and patient under the hardships of war."[1] Never before did Frenchman return from service abroad with such a letter to his king.

On his way to embark at Boston, he was attacked by a fever, which in its violence seemed about to prevail, so that Washington dwelt on the daily tidings of the physician "with tears in his eyes," and it was reported at one time that "the soldier's friend," as he was called, had died.[2] Happily he was spared to his two countries, and to the affection of his commander. Always true to Liberty, he would not let the crew of the frigate waiting for him at Boston be recruited by impressment, — thus in all things guarding the rights of the people.[3]

If the sensation in Europe caused by his departure had been great, that caused by his return, after two years of brilliant service, with eminent military rank, with the thanks of Congress and the friendship of Washington, was greater far. He could not appear anywhere without greetings of admiration which knew no bounds, while, to borrow his own account, he was "consulted by all the ministers, and, what is much better, kissed by all the women."[4] In a journey to his estate, the towns through which he passed honored him with processions and civic pomp. But his distant friends,

[1] Mémoires, Tom. I. pp. 240–243. Washington's Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. VI., Appendix, pp. 503, 504.

[2] Mémoires, Tom. I. pp. 61, 62. According to his Memoirs, the Madeira wine of Boston completed his restoration. "Malgré sa faiblesse extrême, M. de Lafayette, accompagné du docteur, alla sur ses chevaux à Boston, où le vin de Madère acheva de le rétablir." Ibid., p. 63.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 65.

struggling for the Great Declaration, were never out of mind. Accustomed to large interests sustained by small means, he regretted each *fête* even in his own honor as a diversion of supplies, while his zeal went so far as to make the Prime-Minister, M. de Maurepas, declare that for this cause Lafayette would strip Versailles of its furniture. Such an influence, so sincere and so constant, from one who spoke not only as a French noble, but as a Major-General of the American army, was not without result. The papers of Lafayette attest the ability with which he pressed upon the French Government an active participation in the contest, and especially prompted the decisive expedition of Rochambeau.

But he did not loiter at home. Soon he turned from country and family. Again he crossed the sea, and this time landed at Boston, for which, at a later day, he recorded a "predilection,"[1] chiefly, it appears, because there were no slaves there, and all were equal. The hearts of the people everywhere throbbed with welcome; the army partook of this delight, and Washington now "shed tears of joy."[2] The republican sentiments which animated him appear in the present of a flag to one of our battalions, with a simple wreath of laurel blending with a civic crown, and the words beneath, "*No other.*"[3] Farewell to crowns and coronets, to kings and nobles! Such was the great lesson of the flag. Then commenced the second part of his American career, — his active military service, — his command in Virginia, — his campaign against Cornwallis, when the latter said trium-

[1] Lettre à Madame de Lafayette, 5 Août, 1799: Mémoires, Tom. V. p. 71.
[2] Mémoires, Tom. I. p. 259.
[3] Ibid., p. 261, note.

phantly, "The boy shall not escape me," — and his coöperation in the final assault at Yorktown, ending in the capitulation of the British commander to the combined forces of America and France, — all of which belongs to the history of both countries.

The campaign in Virginia redounded to the praise of Lafayette in no common measure. After announcing his designation for this service, and saying that "the command of the troops in that State cannot be in better hands," Washington proceeds: —

"He possesses uncommon military talents, is of a quick and sound judgment, persevering, and enterprising without rashness; and besides these, he is of a very conciliating temper and perfectly sober, which are qualities that rarely combine in the same person. And were I to add that some men will gain as much experience in the course of three or four years as some others will in ten or a dozen, you cannot deny the fact and attack me upon that ground." [1]

Madison wrote at the time that "his having baffled and finally reduced to the defensive so powerful an army as we now know he had to contend with, and with so disproportionate a force, would have done honor to the most veteran officer." [2] The General Assembly of Virginia, by solemn resolution, conceived in the warmest terms of affection and applause, acknowledged "his many great and important services to this Commonwealth in particular, and through it to the United States in general," and tendered to him therefor "the grateful thanks of the free representatives of a free people." They also directed a marble bust of him, "as a lasting monument of his merit and of their gratitude."

[1] Rives's Life and Times of James Madison, Vol. I. p. 294, note.
[2] Letter to Judge Pendleton, November 13, 1781: Ibid., p. 289, note.

This judgment was sanctioned by the highest authorities, including Washington.[1] A recent author adds to this testimony by speaking of the campaign as "masterly," and then characterizes it as "the most brilliant, as well as the most successful, part of his whole public career."[2] But this judgment strangely forgets that lifelong loyalty to Human Rights which in itself is a campaign beyond any in war.

Grim-visaged war now smoothed its wrinkled front, and, in the lull which ensued after the surrender of Cornwallis, Lafayette returned again to France, with the renewed thanks of Congress, and with added trusts. Our ministers abroad were instructed to consult him. The youthful soldier was changed into the more youthful diplomatist; nor was he less efficient in the new field. His presence alone was for our country an Embassy. Through him the haughty Spanish Court was approached, and gigantic forces were gathered at Cadiz for an expedition in the common cause. At the same time his republican character was so far recognized, that the Spanish monarch, anticipating the capture of Jamaica, exclaimed, "Lafayette must not be its governor, as he would make it a republic."[3] Great Britain bowed before the storm and signed the Treaty of Peace, by which American Independence was recognized. It was fit that this great news should reach Congress through

[1] Rives's Life and Times of James Madison, Vol. I. pp. 289, 290, note.

[2] Ibid. An American citizen, who, after enjoying the honors of the nation as Senator and as Minister to France, could become a Proslavery Rebel, was incompetent to sit in judgment on Lafayette. In declaring "the comparative nullity" of his career at home, "contrasted with the unquestionable splendor of his American services and deeds," he writes as a Slave-Master, whose standard of merit excludes what is done for Liberty and Equality.

[3] Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 4.

our greatest benefactor. It was first known by a letter from Lafayette, dated at *Cadiz, February* 5, 1783; so that he who had espoused our cause in its gloom became the herald of its final triumph.

But another letter, bearing date the same day and forwarded by the same vessel with that announcing the glad tidings, opens another duty which already occupied his inmost soul. Thus he writes to Washington, under date of *Cadiz, February* 5, 1783,[1] and the remarkable coincidence of dates shows how closely he associated the rights of the African slave with our National Independence.

"Now, my dear General, that you are going to enjoy some ease and quiet, permit me to propose a plan to you, which might become greatly beneficial to the black part of mankind. Let us unite in purchasing a small estate where we may try the experiment to free the negroes and use them only as tenants. Such an example as yours might render it a general practice; and if we succeed in America, I will cheerfully devote a part of my time to render the method fashionable in the West Indies. *If it be a wild scheme, I had rather be mad this way than to be thought wise in the other task.*"[2]

As if this great proposition were not enough, Lafayette, in the same letter, calls upon Washington to employ himself "in inducing the people of America to strengthen their Federal Union," saying, "It is a work in which it behooves you to be concerned; I look upon it as a necessary measure." Thus were Emancipation and Union conjoint in his regard.

At the date of this letter Lafayette was not yet

[1] Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 58.

[2] Correspondence of the American Revolution: Letters to Washington, ed. Sparks, Vol. III. p. 547. Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 58.

twenty-six years of age, and now, one struggle ended, he begins another greater still, or rather he gives to the first its natural development, and shows how truly he accepts the truths declared by our fathers. Others might hesitate; he does not. In these few words addressed to Washington will be seen the same spirit which inspired him originally to enlist for us, the same instinctive love of Liberty, the same self-sacrifice, the same generosity, the same nobleness, expressed with affecting simplicity and frankness. Valuable as is this testimony for the African race, it is also precious in illustration of that remarkable character, which, from the beginning, was guided by no transient spirit of adventure, but by a sentiment almost divine for Human Rights. In this light his original consecration to our cause assumes new dignity, while American Independence becomes but a stage in the triumphs of that Liberty which is the common birthright of all mankind. If Fox was a *boy-debater*, as he has been called, then was Lafayette a *boy-hero*, — and hero of Humanity he continued to the end.

During the next year, at the pressing invitation of Washington, he again crossed the ocean, to witness the peaceful prosperity of the country whose government he had helped to found by twofold service in war and in diplomacy. Adopted child of the Republic, he surrendered himself for six months to the sympathies of the people, the delights of friendship, and the companionship of Washington, whom he visited at Mount Vernon, and with whom he journeyed. Nor did his partiality for Boston fail at this time, as a contemporary record shows. "The reception I met with in Boston," he wrote, "no words can describe; at least it is impossible to express

what I have felt."[1] But, far more than all, the Slavery of the African race interested his heart, and would not allow him to be silent. In official answers to addresses of welcome from Legislatures of Southern States, he declared his desire to see these Legislatures commence the work of Abolition.[2] This was in 1784, before Clarkson, then a youth at the University, was inspired to write his Essay against Slavery, which was the glorious beginning of his lifelong career, and before Wilberforce brought forward his memorable motion in the British Parliament for the abolition of the slave-trade. If these words were of little effect at that early day, they bear witness none the less to the exalted spirit of their author. In taking leave of Congress, as he was about to embark, he let drop other words, exhibiting the same spirit, wherein may be seen the mighty shadow of the Future. "May this immense temple of Freedom," he said, "ever stand *a lesson to oppressors, an example to the oppressed*, a sanctuary for the rights of mankind! and may these happy United States attain that complete splendor and prosperity which will illustrate the blessings of their government, and for ages to come rejoice the departed souls of its founders!"[3] Such utterance

[1] Letter to Alexander Hamilton, Boston, October 22, 1784: Hamilton's Works, edited by his Son, Vol. I. p. 422.

[2] Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 8. Madison, writing to Jefferson, under date of October 17, 1784, says: "The time I have lately passed with the Marquis has given me a pretty thorough insight into his character. With great natural frankness of temper he unites much address and very considerable talents. In his politics, he says his three hobby-horses are the alliance between France and the United States, the union of the latter, and the manumission of the slaves." (Madison's Letters and other Writings, Vol. I. p. 106.) Call these hobby-horses! They were three practical policies, having their foundation in everlasting principles. How many of our own statesmen saw as wisely?

[3] Journal of Congress, Vol. X. p. 20: December 13, 1784. Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 106.

by a French noble tells that the Revolution was approaching.

The friendship of Washington and Lafayette deserves more than passing mention. It constitutes a memorable part in the life of each. Already we have witnessed its beginning. They saw each other for the last time at Annapolis, where Washington had taken his welcome guest in his carriage from Mount Vernon. There they parted, Washington returning to his peaceful home, Lafayette hastening across the ocean to the great destinies and the great misfortunes which awaited him. But before leaving our shores he wrote a letter from his ship, where he pours out his devotion to his great chief, calling him "the most beloved of all friends he ever had or ever shall have anywhere," declaring his regret that he cannot have "the inexpressible pleasure of embracing him in his own house, of welcoming him in a family where his name is adored," and to this adding: "Everything that admiration, respect, gratitude, friendship, and filial love can inspire is combined in my affectionate heart to devote me most tenderly to you. In your friendship I find a delight which words cannot express."[1] Though never meeting again, their intimacy was prolonged by an interchange of letters, the most remarkable of any in the life of either, by which their friendship is made one, and each lives doubly in the affection of the other.

Returned to Europe, Lafayette sought constant opportunities to promote our interests, — writing especially of Jefferson, our Minister at Paris, that he was "happy

[1] Letter of December 21, 1784: Correspondence of the Revolution, ed. Sparks, Vol. IV. pp 87, 89; Mémoires, Tom. II. pp. 111, 113.

to be his aide-de-camp."[1] Nor did he confine his exertions to France. Traversing Germany, from Brunswick to Vienna, he was everywhere a welcome guest, first with the Emperor, and then with the King of Prussia, who was the famous Frederick, sometimes called the Great, — described by Lafayette, in a picture worthy of a Dutch artist, as "an old, decrepit, and dirty corporal, all covered with Spanish snuff, the head almost resting on one shoulder, and fingers almost dislocated by the gout."[2] Cornwallis of Yorktown, who was there as a visitor also, confessed that at the camp in Silesia "there was a most marked preference for Lafayette."[3] But wherever the hero appeared, our concerns, whether political or commercial, were still present to his thoughts. At the table of Frederick he vindicated American institutions, and especially answered doubts with regard to "the strength of the Union," which he upheld always as a fundamental condition of national prosperity. He confidently looked to our Independence as the fruitful parent of a new order of ages, being that rightful self-government, above all hereditary power, whether of kings or nobles, which he proudly called the "American Era."

His heart was ever intent on projects of Human Improvement. Aroused by the disabilities of Protestants in France, amounting to absolute outlawry, sad heritage of that fatal measure, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Lafayette, though himself a Catholic, entered into earnest efforts for their liberation, and thus en-

[1] Letter to Washington, October 26, 1786: Correspondence of the Revolution, ed. Sparks, Vol. IV. p. 144; Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 157.

[2] Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 131.

[3] Correspondence of Charles, First Marquis Cornwallis, ed. Ross, Vol. I. p. 205.

rolled himself among champions of Religious Freedom. At the same time his opposition to African slavery assumed a practical form. Washington acknowledged his appeal from Cadiz, of 5th February, 1783, but unhappily deferred action.[1] Lafayette went forward alone. At an expense of 125,000 francs, this foremost of Abolitionists purchased a plantation of slaves in the French colony of Cayenne, that by emancipation he might try the great experiment of Free Labor, and set an example to mankind.[2] The spirit of this enterprise was seen on the arrival of the agent from Paris, who began by collecting all the slave-whips and other instruments of punishment on the plantation, and burning them in presence of the slaves. This was in 1785, two years after the original proposition to Washington, who, on learning its execution, thus complimented his more than disciple: —

"The benevolence of your heart, my dear Marquis, is so conspicuous upon all occasions that I never wonder at any fresh proofs of it; but your late purchase of an estate in the colony of Cayenne, with a view of emancipating the slaves on it, is a generous and noble proof of your humanity. Would to God a like spirit might diffuse itself generally into the minds of the people of this country! But I despair of seeing it."[3]

Alas! had Washington at that time united with Lafayette, there would have been a living example of untold value to our country, instead of that dead despair which was like a stone wall in the path of Progress. Who can imagine the good from such an instance,

[1] Letter of 5th April, 1783: Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. VIII. p. 414; Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 74.

[2] Mémoires, Tom. II. pp. 9, 139; Tom. III. p. 72.

[3] Letter of 10th May, 1786: Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. IX. p. 168.

teaching the priceless benefits of Freedom? Who can estimate its happy influence in extinguishing that great controversy which is not yet ended? It is sad to think that such an opportunity was lost.

While organizing Emancipation in the distant colony of Cayenne, Lafayette gave other evidence to his American friends. In a letter to John Adams, our Minister in London, dated February 22, 1786, he expresses himself with a vigor never surpassed during the long warfare with Slavery. "In the cause of my black brethren," he writes, "I feel myself warmly interested, and most decidedly side, so far as respects them, *against the white part of mankind.* Whatever be the complexion of the enslaved, it does not, in my opinion, alter the complexion of the crime which the enslaver commits, a crime much blacker than any African face."[1]

The following brief note to Alexander Hamilton is another gem of character.

"PARIS, April 13, 1785.

"MY DEAR HAMILTON, — . . . . In one of your New York Gazettes I find an association *against the slavery of negroes,* which seems to me worded in such a way as to give no offence to the moderate men in the Southern States. As I ever have been *partial to my brethren of that color,* I wish, if you are one in the society, you would move, in your own name, for my being admitted on the list. My best respects wait on Mrs. Hamilton. Adieu.

"Your affectionate friend,

"LAFAYETTE."[2]

How much in little! The testimony is plain. The witness is a volunteer. In simple words he records him-

[1] Works of John Adams, Vol. VIII. p. 376.

[2] Hamilton's Works, edited by his Son, Vol. I. pp. 423, 424.

self once more "against the slavery of negroes," and then declares that he has ever been "partial to his brethren of that color." For him the degraded slave is brother, although of a color not his own.

That great event was now at hand, which, beginning in a claim of rights denied, and inspired by generous ideas, was destined, amidst falling privileges and toppling thrones, to let loose the most direful furies of Discord and War, — to feed the scaffold with blood of King and Queen, and of good men in all the ranks of life, — to lift the nation to unknown heights of audacity and power, — to dash back the hosts of foreign invasion, as the angry surge from the rock, — to achieve victory on a scale of grandeur never witnessed since the eagles of Cæsar passed from Britain to Egypt, — and, finally, to mark a new epoch in the history of the Human Family. The French Revolution had come. It was foreshadowed in the writings of philosophers, in the gradual march of Human Progress, in the wide-spread influence of the American Revolution, in the growing instincts of the people, and the obvious injustice of existing things, — and it was begun in the example of Lafayette. Of all men, he was its natural leader, just so long as it continued moderate and humane. Alas, that such a cause, so beautiful in itself and so grand in promise, was wrested from its original character by the passions of men!

The initial step was the Assembly of the Notables, February 22d, 1787, brought together for the first time since its convocation to serve the arbitrary rule of Cardinal Richelieu. There sat the two brothers of the King, all the princes of the blood, archbishops, bishops, dukes, peers, the chancellor, high officials of the

magistracy, and distinguished nobles, convoked by the King in the interest of his crown. But the people had no representative there. Lafayette became their representative. As he had formerly drawn his sword, so now he raised his voice for popular rights; nor was he deterred by the courtly presence. Startled by his boldness, the Count d'Artois, afterwards Charles the Tenth, attempted to call him to order, as acting on subjects not before the Assembly. "We are summoned," said Lafayette, "to make the truth known to his Majesty. I must discharge my duty." He proceeded, and here you see how the great tragedy opened.

By formal propositions, sustained by well-considered reasons, he called for: 1. Removal of Protestant disabilities, and complete establishment of religious toleration; 2. Equality of imposts, and suppression of certain unjust taxes; 3. Abolition of all arbitrary imprisonment, and especially the odious *lettre-de-cachet;* 4. Revision of the criminal laws; 5. Economy in the royal household, pensions, and all the departments of government.

Following these moderate demands, he made a "motion," — the first time, it is said, this parliamentary word, so suggestive of liberal discussion, was ever used in France, — and this motion was for nothing less than the convocation of a "National Assembly," — uttering here two other momentous words, which were then and there for the first time pronounced. "What!" exclaimed the Count d'Artois, "do you demand the States General?" "Yes, and even more," was the reply of Lafayette.[1]

[1] Lady Morgan's France, Vol. I. p. 71. Ticknor's Outlines of the Life of Lafayette, p. 19. Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 177.

The States General were convened in May, 1789, at Versailles, in the very shadow of that palace where in latter years the kings and courtiers of the French monarchy had lived like the gods of Olympus, and at once this ancient body took the name of "National Assembly." Here appeared the imposing figure of Mirabeau, demanding, in the name of the people, that the troops should be removed. By his side was the yet youthful Lafayette, seconding the demand, which he followed by proposing a *Declaration of the Rights of Man*, embodying not merely specific rights secured by precedent and practice, as in the English Bill of Rights, but the Rights of Man founded on Nature, and above all precedent or practice. Such a statement was known in our country. It constitutes part of the Declaration of Independence, and also of the Constitution of Massachusetts, giving character to each; but it was now for the first time put forth in Europe, illustrating that "American Era" which Lafayette constantly proclaimed. Its importance was immense. It supplied a touchstone for all wrongs, and elevated the hearts of the people. It began as follows.

"Nature has made men free and equal; the distinctions necessary for social order are founded on general utility only. Every man is born with rights inalienable and imprescriptible: such are the liberty of his opinions; the care of his honor and of his life; the right of property; the entire disposal of his person, of his industry, of all his faculties; the communication of his thoughts by all means possible; the pursuit of happiness; and resistance to oppression."[1]

In launching this Declaration, Lafayette vindicated it as "recalling sentiments which Nature has engraved

[1] Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 252.

on the heart of every one, but which take new force when recognized by all; and this development," he said, "becomes the more interesting, since for a nation to love Liberty it is sufficient that she knows it, and to be free it is sufficient that she wills it." He stated its further value as "an expression of those truths from which all institutions should spring, and by which the representatives of the nation should be guided."[1]

The Declaration of the Rights of Man, presented 11th July, 1789, was a victory whose influence can never die. It redounded immediately to the glory of Lafayette. Lally-Tollendal, after declaring the ideas "grand and majestic," said that their author "speaks of Liberty as he has already defended it." These were words of sympathy. Already the Archbishop of Sens had remarked in the councils of the King, "Lafayette is the most dangerous of antagonists, as his politics are all in action."

A few days later, the Bastile, at once fortress and prison, where for four hundred years the lawless will of arbitrary power had buried its victims in a living tomb, was levelled to the ground by the people of Paris, and with it fell the ancient monarchy. Elated by success, the people looked for a leader, and found him in the author of the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Amidst heartfelt applause Lafayette was placed at the head of the embodied militia of the metropolis, which, under his auspices, was organized as the National Guard. Thus in a brief time two achievements were his, — first, the introduction of a Declaration of the Rights of Man, which he was foremost to present, and, secondly, the organization of the National Guard, which was the

[1] Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 251.

beginning of a citizen soldiery. Each was an event; the two together make an epoch.

Thus far champion of Liberty, it was now his part to maintain order; and never was this work more conscientiously pursued. The colors of Paris were *blue* and *red*, but his spirit of conciliation was shown by adding to them *white*, which was the ancient color of France, out of these three forming that famous *tricolor*, which he then proudly proclaimed was destined "to make the tour of the world." Strong in the popularity he had won, he shrank from none of the responsibilities of his perilous post, braving alike the multitude and the assassin, — unharmed himself, treading calmly the burning ploughshares of civil strife, — throwing over all the shield of his protection, and by chivalrous intervention at Versailles saving King and Queen from an infuriated mob, — but always telling the King, that, if his Majesty separated the royal cause from that of the people, he should remain with the people: of all which there are details written in blood.

Though engrossed by his post as Commander of the National Guard, Lafayette did not neglect those other duties as representative of the people. In the Assembly he boldly proclaimed the right of resistance to tyranny, saying, with sententious point, "Where Slavery prevails, the most sacred of duties is insurrection."[1] He called for trial by jury, — liberty of worship, — the rights of colored people in the colonies, — the suppression of all privileges, — the abolition of the nobility itself. To one who asked, how, after the abolition of titles, they would replace the words "ennobled for hav-

[1] Speech in the National Assembly, February 20, 1790: Mémoires, Tom. II. p. 383.

ing saved the State on a particular day," he answered, "Simply by declaring that on the day named the person in question saved the State." The proposition prevailed, and from that time this sincere and upright citizen laid down his own time-honored title, borne by his family for successive generations, and was known only as Lafayette. And otherwise he gave testimony by example, — accepting the honorary command of the National Guard formed by colored citizens of San Domingo, although he refused this distinction from other guards out of Paris, and entertaining colored men in the uniform of the National Guard at his dinner-table, where Clarkson, the English Abolitionist, met them in 1789.[1]

Beyond question, he was now the most exalted citizen of France, — centre of all eyes, all hopes, and all fears, — holding in his hand the destinies of King and people. Rarely has such elevation been achieved; never was such elevation so honestly won, and never was it surrounded by responsibilities so appalling. Nothing of office, honor, or power was beyond his reach, while peril of all kinds lay in wait for him or sat openly in his path. But he was indifferent alike to temptation and to danger. Emoluments in whatsoever form he rejected, saying that he attached no more importance to the rejection than to the acceptance. Field-Marshal, Grand-Constable, Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom, Dictator even, — such were titles which he put aside. Had his been a vulgar ambition, he might have clutched at supreme power, and played the part of Cromwell or Napoleon. But, true to the example of Washington,

[1] Mémoires, Tom. III. p. 71, note. Clarkson, History of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade, (Philadelphia, 1808,) Vol. II. pp. 106, 107.

and, above all, true to himself and those just sentiments which belonged to his nature, he thought only of the good of all. Calmly looking down upon the formless chaos, where ancient landmarks were heaving in confused mass, he sought to assuage the wide-spread tumult, and to establish that divine tranquillity, which, like the repose of Nature, is found only in harmony with law, to the end that Human Rights, always sacred, should have new force from the prevailing order. And this done, it was his precious desire to withdraw into the retirement of his home.

The Constitution, with its Declaration of the Rights of Man, was at length proclaimed. Amidst unprecedented pomp, in a vast field, the Campus Martius of France, surrounded by delegates from all parts of the country, and under the gaze of the anxious people gathered in uncounted multitudes, the King, sitting upon his throne, took the oath to support it. Lafayette, as Major-General of the Federation, did the same, — while National Guard and people, by voice and outstretched hand, united in the oath. How faithfully he kept this oath, true to the Constitution in all respects, upholding each department in its powers, subduing violence, watching the public peace, and for the sake of these hazarding his good name with the people whose idol he was, — all this belongs to the history of France. Assured that the Revolution had accomplished its work, he caused an amnesty to be proclaimed, and then deliberately laid down his vast military power. Amidst the gratulations of his countrymen and votes of honor, he withdrew to the bosom of his family at the home of his childhood. Unhappily, this was for a period very brief.

The emigrant nobles, with two brothers of the King, were gathering forces on the Rhenish frontier of France. Austria and Prussia had joined in coalition for the same hostile purpose. France was menaced; but its new government hurled three armies to meet the invaders. The army of the centre was placed under the command of Lafayette. At the mention of his name in the Assembly there was an outburst of applause, and when he appeared at its bar, the President, addressing him, said, "France will oppose to her enemies the Constitution and Lafayette." Little was then foreseen how soon thereafter both were to fall.

A new influence was showing itself. Danton and Robespierre were active. Clubs were organized, whose daily meetings lashed the people to lawless frenzy. Extreme counsels prevailed. Violence and outrage ensued. The Jacobins, whose very name has become a synonym for counsellors of sedition, were beginning to be dominant. The Revolution was losing its original character. The generous Lafayette, who had been its representative and its glory, in whom its true grandeur and humanity were all personified, revolted at its excesses. From camp he addressed the National Assembly, denouncing the Jacobins as substituting license for liberty, — and then, supporting his letter, gallantly appeared at the bar of the Assembly and repeated his denunciation. But the Reign of Terror was lowering, destined to fill France with darkness, and to send a shudder through the world. After bloody conflict at the gates of the palace, the King and his family were driven to seek protection in the bosom of the Assembly. The scaffold was not yet entirely ready. But the Constitution was overturned, and with it Lafayette. Doubly

faithful, first to the oath he had taken, and then to his own supreme integrity, he denounced the audacious crime. He was then at the head of his army; but Jacobin hate had marked him as victim. Shrinking from the horrors of civil contest, where success is purchased only by the blood of fellow-citizens, he resolved — sad alternative! — to withdraw from his post, and, passing into neutral territory, seek the United States, there from a distance to watch the storm which was desolating his own unhappy country.

As his eminence was without precedent, so also was his fall. Power, fortune, family, country, all were suddenly changed for a dungeon, where, amidst cruel privations, for more than five years, he wore away life. But not in vain; for who can listen to the story of his captivity without confessing new admiration for that sublime fidelity to principle which illumined his dungeon?

With heart rent by anguish and darkened by the gathering clouds, Lafayette, accompanied by a few friends, left his army at Sedan. Traversing the frontier, in the hope of reaching Holland, he fell into the hands of the Royal Coalition; and then commenced the catalogue of indignities and hardships under which his soul seemed rather to rise than to bend. His application for a passport was answered by the jeer that his passport would be for the scaffold, while a mob of furious royalists sought to anticipate the executioner. The King of Prussia, hoping to profit from his increasing debility, suggested that his situation would be improved in return for information against France. The patriot was aroused at this attempt on his character. "The King of Prussia is very impertinent," he replied, while composing himself to the continued rigors which beset him. First im-

mured at Wesel on the Rhine, he was next transported in a cart, by a long journey, to the far-famed Magdeburg, whose secrets have been disclosed by Baron Trenck, where for a year he was plunged in a damp subterranean dungeon, closed by four successive doors, all fastened by iron bolts, padlocks, and chains, when, on the separate peace between Prussia and the French Republic, he was handed over to Austrian jailers, by whom he was transferred to Olmütz, an outlying fortress, then little known, but now memorable in history, on the eastern border of Austria, further east than the old castle which witnessed the imprisonment of Richard Cœur-de-Lion and the generous devotion of Blondel. Here his captivity was complete. Alone in his cell, with no object in sight except the four walls, — shut out from all communication with the world, — shut out even from all knowledge of his family, who on their part could know nothing of him, — never addressed by name, — mentioned in the bulletins of the prison only by his number, — and, to cut off all possible escape by self-destruction, deprived of knife and fork: such was now his lot. If not a slave compelled to work without wages, he was even a more wretched captive.

But never for one moment was his soul shaken in its majestic fidelity; never was his example more lofty. At the beginning, he was careful, by official declaration, to make known his principles, so that he might not be confounded with fugitive royalists. But his prison cell was a constant testimony. Letters now exist, written at peril of life, with toothpick dipped in soot moistened with vinegar, where his wonderful nature is laid bare.[1] Confessing his joy that he suffers from

[1] Mémoires, Tom. IV. pp. 221, 230, 231.

that despotism which he combated, rather than from the people he loved so well, he announces his equal hostility to the committees of Jacobinism and the cabinet of the Coalition, — declares his firm conviction, that, amidst all the shocks of anarchy, Liberty will not perish, — remembers with a thrill the anniversary of American Independence, as that day comes round, — says of his own Declaration of the Rights of Man, that, if he were alone in the universe, he would not hesitate to maintain it,[1] and repels with scorn every effort to vindicate him at the expense of his well-known sentiments, declaring that he would give his blood, drop by drop, to the people's cause, and that on the scaffold his first and last words should be "Liberty and Equality," while he charges all the wrongs, all the crimes, all the perils, all the sufferings of the Revolution upon the wretched departure from these sacred principles.[2] His political faith was grandly declared, when, addressing the Minister of the United States at London, he calls down a blessing upon our Republic, saying, "May *Liberty and Equality*, with all the virtues truly republican, honest industry, moderation, purity of manners, frankness and liberality of spirit, obedience to the laws, firmness against all usurpation, continue to prove that American Freedom has its roots deep, not only in the head, but at the bottom of the heart of its citizens! May public prosperity, happiness of individuals, and federal concord be a perpetual recompense to the United States, and an example for other people!"[3] These words of benediction, original as great, aptly define that "American Era" which our hero had already hailed, while they

[1] Mémoires, Tom. IV. p. 288.
[2] Ibid., pp. 237, 238.
[3] Ibid., p. 242.

invoke upon our country all that virtuous heart could desire. But never did soul rise to purer heights than when, at the beginning of his captivity, he bequeathed this consoling truth as his legacy to mankind, that the satisfaction from a single service rendered to Humanity outweighs any suffering inflicted by enemies, or even by the ingratitude of the people,[1] — and then, as the dungeon closed upon him, forgetting all that he was called to undergo, his own personal afflictions and prolonged captivity, he sends his thoughts to the poor slaves on his distant plantation in Cayenne, whose emancipation he had sought to accomplish. In the universal wreck of his fortunes he knew not what had become of this plantation, but he trusts that his wife "will take care that the blacks who cultivate it shall preserve their liberty."[2] Search history, whether ancient or modern pages, let Greece and Rome testify, but you can find nothing more sublimely touching than this voice from that heavy-bolted dungeon, serenely pleading for the liberty of others far away. That noblest woman, mated with him in soul as in marriage vow, had already exerted herself to accomplish this purpose, — but, alas! without effect. Cruelly was their liberty confiscated with his estates.[3]

This confiscation, where Liberty itself disappeared, was the terrible climax of that proscription which now enveloped his friends and his family. In the prevailing masquerade of blood the charge of *Fayettism* was equivalent to a decree of death. Nor was tender woman

[1] Mémoires, Tom. III. p. 412; Tom. IV. p. 229.

[2] Lettre à Madame d'Hénin, Magdebourg, 13 Mars, 1793 : Mémoires, Tom. IV. p. 224; Sparks's Life of Gouverneur Morris, Vol. I. p. 410; Washington's Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. IX. p. 163, note.

[3] Mémoires, Tom. III. pp. 72 and 401, note.

spared. The grandmother, the mother, and the sister of his wife, all of the same ducal house, perished on the scaffold. His wife was thrown into prison, and escaped the same fate only by the timely overthrow of Robespierre. Regaining liberty after a cruel imprisonment of sixteen months, her maternal care was for her son, George Washington Lafayette, still a boy, whom she sent to his great namesake at Mount Vernon with a letter from herself, and then, accompanied by her two youthful daughters, with the protection of an American passport, she makes her way across Germany to Vienna, where she throws herself before the Imperial despot. To her prayer for the release of her husband, he answers that "his hands are tied"; but, moved by her devotion, so womanly, so wifely, so heroic, he yields so far as to consent that she, with her daughters, may share his wretched captivity. Penetrating his dungeon, she learned that the first change of raiment allowed him was on her arrival, when the tattered rags which scarcely covered his emaciated form were exchanged for a garb of coarsest material,—an indulgence not accorded without the insult of informing him that this had been purposely sought, as with such alone was he worthy to be clothed.[1] Three silver forks in her little inventory were seized by the jailer, and this refined family during a lingering imprisonment were driven to eat with their fingers. These things are not to be forgotten, because, while exhibiting the cruelty of despotic power, against which the world now rises in judgment, they show how his fidelity was tried, as also that of his family. The wife, becoming ill, was refused permission to

[1] Speech of Gen. Fitzpatrick in the House of Commons, December 16, 1796: Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XXXII. col. 1353.

leave the dungeon for medical advice at Vienna, except on condition of not returning, when she beautifully declared, for herself and her daughters, that they had agreed to participate the rigors of his captivity, and now repeated, with all their hearts, that they were happier with him in the dungeon than they could be anywhere else without him. Lafayette himself, when tempted by offer of release on certain conditions or promises, was stern as his jailer, and refused inexorably, — choosing to suffer, sooner than compromise in any respect his rights and duties as Frenchman or as American citizen, which latter title he always claimed.

Vain, during this long period, was every effort for his liberation. Not Fox, thundering in the British Parliament, — not the gentler voice of Wilberforce, uniting with Fox, — not Cornwallis, his old enemy at Yorktown, personally pleading with the Emperor himself,[1] — not Washington, prompting our Ministers abroad and writing directly to the Emperor, could open these prison doors.[2] Lafayette was declared to be a representative not only of the French Revolution, but of Universal Enfranchisement, whose liberty was incompatible with the safety of European governments: therefore must he be immured in a dungeon. But private enterprise,

[1] "M. de la Fayette est de ces hommes que nous devons aimer, et lors de sa captivité je me présentai à l'Empereur pour réclamer sa liberté, que je n'ai pas eu le bonheur d'obtenir." This is the report, by Joseph Bonaparte, of the conversation of Lord Cornwallis at the dinner-table of the former, in 1802. — *Memoires du Roi Joseph*, Tom. I. pp. 86, 87.

[2] In this effort Washington responded to the appeal of Madame de Lafayette by letter to himself. "In this abyss of misery," she wrote, "the idea of owing to the United States and to Washington the life and liberty of M. de Lafayette kindles a ray of hope in my heart. I hope everything from the goodness of the people with whom he has set an example of that Liberty of which he is now made the victim." — *Letter of October* 8, 1792: Washington's Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. p. 316, note.

inspired by those generous promptings which are the glory of the human heart, for a moment seemed about to prevail. This was before the arrival of his wife and daughters. The health of the imprisoned champion had suffered to such degree, that, under medical direction, the rigors of confinement were relaxed so far as to allow occasional exercise in the open air. Here was an opportunity for which two friends, Bollmann, a German, and Huger, an American, of South Carolina, had watched for months, and they were able secretly to apprise the captive of their plans. With their assistance, after desperate conflict, in which his hand was torn to the bone, he succeeded in disarming the guards, and then enjoyed a gleam of liberty. It was a gleam only. Helped on a horse by one of his devoted friends, he started; but, ignorant of the way, and oppressed with fatigue, wounded, bleeding, after a flight of twenty-four hours, he was recaptured, brought back, and plunged again into the worst torments of his dungeon. This endeavor, though unsuccessful, is never read without a gush of gratitude towards the courageous men, who, taking life in hand, braved Austrian tyranny. Human nature seems more beautiful from their example.[1]

All had now failed, and the dungeon seemed to have closed upon Lafayette forever. The hearts of his friends were wrung with anguish, and especially here in America. Washington, at the fireside of Mount Vernon, shed tears for his friend, — while to that noble wife, who in all things was not less faithful than her heroic husband, he addressed an earnest letter, regretting that he had not words to convey his feelings, and placing a con-

[1] Exhibiting this chivalrous incident, Mr. Sumner had in mind our fugitive slaves and the generous souls who did not shrink from helping them.

siderable sum of money to her credit, which he mentioned as the least he was indebted for services, of which he had never yet received an account.[1] But an intervention was at hand which would not be denied. It was the early sword of Napoleon Bonaparte, which, flashing across the Alps from his Italian victories, broke open the dungeon of Olmütz. Lafayette had been a captive five years, — his wife and daughters shut up with him twenty-two months. In the negotiations ending in the Treaty of Campo Formio, it was required, under special instructions from the French Directory, that he should be released; and the conqueror was heard to say afterwards, that, among all the sacrifices exacted of tottering Austria, not one was so difficult to obtain. The captive of many years, at last in the enjoyment of liberty, hastened to Hamburg, where he found welcome with the American consul.

This was in the autumn of 1797, and he was forty years of age. But life with him, though brief in years, had been extended by events full of lessons never to be forgotten; above all was that great lesson of perpetual fealty to Human Rights. And now this same lesson was illustrated again. As in dungeon, so in exile, Lafayette could not forget the cause to which his life was devoted, especially the liberty of the African. From the obscure retreat in Holstein, where he lingered, he addresses Clarkson, the English Abolitionist, in eloquent words, against the Slave-Trade, which was still the scandal of nations, and announces that the mission of France, while healing the wounds of the past, should be to assure *Liberty for all, whether white or black*, under the

[1] Letter to the Marchioness de Lafayette, January 31, 1793: Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. p. 315.

equal protection of Law.[1] Better far such mission than battle and conquest, which this ambitious nation craved. In a letter to Washington at the same time he gives utterance to his aspiration, that, for the good of the world, the North and the South should gradually adopt the principles on which the Independence and the Liberty of the United States have been happily founded.[2] How in thinking of himself Lafayette thought instinctively of the slave appears in an incident of exile at this time. In the straitened circumstances to which he was reduced, stripped of the wealth to which he was born, poor and homeless, his thoughts turned to the broad continent across the Atlantic, and he conceived the plan of buying a farm, — although without what he denominates "the first dollar" necessary, — either in Virginia, not far from what he calls the "Federal City," or in New England, not far from Boston, — and thus, in one of those tender letters to his wife, he balances between these two places. "I am aware, dear Adrienne," he writes, under date of 5th August, 1799, "that I, who complain of the serfs of Holstein, as something very melancholy to a friend of Liberty, should find in the valley of the Shenandoah negro slaves; for Equality, which in the Northern States is for everybody, exists in the Southern States for the whites only. Therefore, while I perceive all the reasons which should draw us to the neighborhood of Mount Vernon and the seat of the Federal Union, yet I should prefer New England."[3] Never more simply or conclusively was the special difference between North and South presented for judgment.

[1] Letter dated Lemkuhlen, 27 Janvier, 1798: Mémoires, Tom. IV. p. 403.
[2] Letter of 20th April, 1798: Ibid., p. 432.
[3] Ibid., Tom. V. p. 71.

Regaining his country at last, while the outlawry, though a dead letter, was not formally annulled, he withdrew to the retirement of Lagrange, where, surrounded by his family, he maintained unsullied the integrity of his great character, — turning aside from all temptation, and never for a moment swerving from completest devotion to that cause for which he had done and suffered so much. Others accepted office and honor; he would not. Bonaparte wished to make him Senator; Lafayette declined, as he afterwards declined the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor from the same hand. Always himself, he touched the key-note of his life, when, in a brief address to his fellow-citizens, on refusing a post of dignity in 1802, he announced his hope that the miracles of battle then surprising them might be followed not only by peace abroad, but by domestic tranquillity founded on the immutable principles of Justice. At no moment is he more exemplary in firmness than when on the proposition that Bonaparte should be Consul for life he openly voted "No," and added, "I cannot vote for such a magistracy, until Liberty has been sufficiently guarantied."[1] In a noble letter[2] he pleads with the successful warrior for the re-establishment of Liberty, saying that all things combine to fit him for this great work, which shall subdue danger and calm distrust. Bonaparte did not hearken to these words of patriot wisdom, but drove still further in mad career. Lafayette, withdrawing yet more into the repose of private life, avoided a contest, which he foresaw must be futile, with a ruler having claims upon his gratitude which he never ceased to acknowledge.

[1] Mémoires, Tom. V. p. 198.
[2] May 20, 1802. Ibid., pp. 199, 200.

But it was not in his nature to despair. President Jefferson urged him in 1804, after the acquisition of Louisiana, to quit France, where the ground trembled beneath his feet, and come to a land where he could do so much good, — holding before him the governorship of the new Territory, and declaring that his presence alone would be better for its tranquillity than an army of ten thousand men. But Lafayette avowed his unwillingness to take a step that should seem to abandon the destinies of his own country, duty to which forbade him to despair of seeing established on the foundation of a just and generous Liberty, — in one word, American Liberty.[1]

While in retirement, he was visited by temptation in yet another form, and again his fidelity shines forth. By Act of Congress, repaying in part the accumulated debt of the nation, he had become proprietor of a large territory in Louisiana, to which in his reduced condition he naturally looked for means. Persons familiar with the country advised him to set up a manufacture of tiles, promising from it, what he so much desired, "a fixed revenue"; but he dismissed the proposition, as "founded upon a purchased employment of thirty slaves," — "a thing," said he, "*I detest*, and shall never do"; and then, after expressing his wish that in letting the land there should be "a first condition to employ none but free hands, or, if negroes of New Orleans be admitted, to stipulate their liberty in a short time," he proceeds to say, in memorable words: "I would not be concerned in transactions in a negro country, *unless not only my personal doings were unsullied with Slavery, but I had provided with others to render the very spot pro-*

[1] Mémoires, Tom. V. pp. 257, 258, 261.

ductive of Freedom."[1] This was in 1805, before the Slave-Trade was yet abolished, and when Slavery was just beginning its fatal empire over our Republic. But it was only part of that faithful testimony which he bore so constantly.

Such a character was a perpetul protest, and Napoleon in the pride of colossal power confessed it. Son and son-in-law, though distinguished, could not obtain promotion, — the Emperor himself on one occasion erasing their names, with the tyrannical ejaculation, "These Lafayettes cross my path everywhere." The true reason was disclosed, when, at another time, he said: "Lafayette alone in France holds fast to his original ideas of Liberty. Though tranquil now, he will reappear, if occasion offers." Stronger homage to absolute fidelity could not be. He was tranquil, through all the splendid agony of the Empire, its marvellous conquests and its tremendous disasters, — tranquil at the victories of Austerlitz, Jena, Friedland, and Wagram, at the retreat from Moscow, at the stunning news from Leipsic, at the capitulation of Paris. As little could he participate in the restoration of Louis as in the usurpation of Napoleon. At last he reappeared. It was on the return from Elba, hazarding that peace purchased at such sacrifice, when, by characteristic action in harmony with his whole career, his present was linked with his past, and the chief of the Great Revolution, declining again the honors of the Senate and the title of Count, declaring, that, if ever again he entered public life, it must be as representative of the people, came forward as simple deputy, and then at an early day, with happy phrase, rallied the Chamber to an attitude of inde-

[1] Letter to Mr. Madison, 22d April, 1805, MS.

pendence which should decide "whether it would be called a national representation or a Napoleon club." The disaster of Waterloo hastened the impending crisis. The Emperor menaced a dissolution of the Chamber and a dictatorship. The time had come for the hero of Liberty. He spoke, and with a voice that had been silent for a generation bravely recalled the sacred cause of which he was the veteran, and that tri-color flag which was the symbol of Liberty, Equality, and Public Order. On his motion the Chamber declared itself permanent, and any attempt to dissolve it treason; and then, while vindicating France against the imputation of fickleness towards Napoleon, whom it had followed over uncounted fields, from the sands of Egypt to the snows of Russia, the Defender of Liberty insisted upon his abdication. Yet, true always to every just sentiment of gratitude and humanity, he scorned the idea of surrendering the fallen man to the Allies, saying he was "astonished that such a proposition should be addressed to a prisoner of Olmütz,"[1] and he sought to provide means for escape to America, showing him every consideration consistent with duty to the country.

The fall of Napoleon was followed by the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France, lasting from 1815 to 1830, and during much of this period Lafayette, released from all constraint, was member of the Chamber of Deputies. The King, who in early life had known him personally, trembled at his election. As he entered the Chamber for the first time, every eye turned to him, and every tongue pronounced his name with admiration, hope, or fear; nor was any member

[1] Biographie Universelle (Michaud), Supplément, Tom. LXIX. p. 382, art. LAFAYETTE.

observed afterwards with equal interest. He took his seat on the extreme left, and always kept it. His attendance was marked by that fidelity which belonged to his nature; nor did advancing years or any disgust interfere with the constant and unwearied discharge of his parliamentary duties. Here, as everywhere, he was open, sincere, and brave. Overtopping others in character, he was conspicuous also in debate. Though not a rhetorician, he spoke with ease and effect, while every word had the inspiration of noble ideas, often expressed with sententious force. Especially was he moved whenever Liberty came in question; nor did the disasters falling upon him and his house, or any other consideration, make him hesitate to vindicate the Revolution, alike in substantial results and in principles. "Notwithstanding," he said, "all that was afterwards lost through anarchy, terrorism, bankruptcy, and civil war, in spite of a terrible struggle against all Europe, there remains the incontestable truth, that agriculture, industry, public instruction, the comfort and independence of three quarters of the population, and the public morals, have been improved to a degree of which there is no example in any equal period of history, or in any other part of the Old World."[1] With brilliant effect he portrayed the wrongs and abuses which disappeared before what he liked to call "the flag of Liberty, Equality, and Public Order."[2] And he attributed the evils of France less to the madness of violence than to compromise of conscience by timid men. In the same lofty spirit he denounced the Holy Alliance as "a vast and powerful league whose object was to enslave and brutify man-

[1] Speech in the Chamber of Deputies, June 4, 1819: Mémoires, Tom. VI. pp. 50, 51.

[2] Speech in the Chamber of Deputies, May 27, 1820: Ibid., p. 88.

kind."[1] By such utterances were the people schooled and elevated. The inspiration which was his own inner light he imparted to others.

His parliamentary career was interrupted by an episode which belongs to the poetry of history. On the unanimous invitation of the Congress of the United States, he again visited the land whose Independence he helped to secure. This was in 1824. Forty years had passed since he was last here. But throughout this long period of a life transcendent in activity and privations, as well as in fame, he had ever turned with fondness to the scene of his early consecration, and proudly avowed himself American in heart and American in principle. His early compeers were all numbered with the dead, and he remained sole survivor among the generals of Washington. But the people had multiplied, and the country had grown in wealth and power. All rose to meet his coming, and he was welcomed everywhere as the Nation's guest. To the inquiry, on his landing at New York, how he would be addressed, he replied, "As an American General," — thus discarding again the title of his birth. From beginning to end, men and women, young and old, official bodies, towns, cities, States, Congress, all vied in testimonies of devotion and gratitude, while the children of the schools, boys and maidens, swelled the incomparable holiday, which, stretching from North to South, and covering the whole country, absorbed for the time every difference, and made all feel as children of one household.

[1] Speech in the Chamber of Deputies, July 9, 1829: Mémoires, Tom. VI. p. 313 Biographie Universelle (Michaud), Supplément, Tom. LXIX. p. 388, art. LAFAYETTE.

The strong and universal sentiment found expression in familiar words, repeated everywhere: —

"We bow not the neck,
We bend not the knee,
But our hearts, Lafayette,
We surrender to thee."

It belongs to the glory of Lafayette that he inspired this sentiment, and it belongs to the glory of our country to have felt it. As there was never such a guest, so was there never such a host. They were alike without parallel. But amidst this grandest hospitality, binding him by new ties, he kept the loyalty of his heart: he did not forget the African slave.[1]

The visit was full of memorable incidents, sometimes most touching, among which I select a scene little known. At one of those receptions occurring wherever the national guest appeared, a veteran of the Revolution, in his original Continental uniform, with the addition of a small blanket, or rather piece of blanket, upon the shoulders, and with his ancient musket, that had seen service on many fields, came forward. Drawing himself up in the stiff manner of the old-fashioned drill, he made a military salute, which Lafayette returned with affection, tears starting to his eyes, — for he remembered well that uniform, and saw that an old soldier, more venerable than himself in years, stood before him. "Do you know me?" said the soldier, — for

[1] Mémoires, Tom. VI. pp. 185, 220. There is also a correspondence with Colonel Seaton, of the *National Intelligencer*, on this interesting subject. A letter to the latter, dated January 1, 1827, has seen the light since this address, where, alluding to the District of Columbia, Lafayette says: "The state of Slavery, especially in that emporium of foreign visitors and European ministers, is a most lamentable drawback on the example of independence and freedom presented to the world by the United States." — *William Winston Seaton, a Biographical Sketch*, p. 267.

the manner of the General persuaded him that he was personally remembered, although nearly fifty years had passed since their service together. "Indeed, I cannot remember you," the General replied frankly. "Do you remember the frosts and snows of Valley Forge?" "I can never forget them," said Lafayette. The veteran then related, that, one freezing night, as the General went his rounds, he came upon a sentry thinly clad, with shoes of raw cowhide and without stockings, about to perish with cold; that he took the musket of the sentry, saying to him, "Go to my hut; you will find stockings there, and a blanket, which, after warming yourself, you will bring here; meanwhile give me your musket, and I will keep guard." "I obeyed," the veteran continued, "and returning to my post refreshed, you cut the blanket in two, retaining one half and giving me the other. Here, General, is that half, and I am the sentry whose life you saved." Saint Martin dividing his cloak is a kindred story of the Church, portrayed by the genius of Vandyck.[1] Lafayette, at the date of his charity, was younger even than the Saint, and the act was not less saintly. But this is only an instance of the gratitude he met. By such tribute, in accord with the universal popular heart, was the triumph of our benefactor carried beyond that of any Roman ascending the Capitol with the spoils of war.

And this might have been the crown even of his exalted life. But at home in France there was yet further need of him. In the madness of tyranny, Charles the Tenth undertook by arbitrary ordinance to trample on popular rights, and to subvert the Charter under which

[1] Mrs. Jameson's Sacred and Legendary Art, pp. 424–427.

he held his throne. The people were aroused. The streets of Paris were filled with barricades. France was heaving as in other days. Then turned all eyes to the patriarch of Lagrange, who, already hero of two revolutions, commanded confidence alike by his principles and his bravery. Summoned from his country home, he repaired to Paris, imparting instant character to the movement. With a few devoted friends about him, — one of whom is a dear and honored friend of my own, Dr. Howe, of Boston, — this venerable citizen, seventy-three years of age, exposed to all the perils of the conflict hotly raging in the streets between the people and the troops, was conducted on foot across barricades to the Hôtel de Ville, and once more placed at the head of the National Guard. "Liberty shall triumph," said the veteran, "or we will all perish together."[1] Charles the Tenth ceased to reign, and the Revolution of 1830 was accomplished. The fortunes of France were now in the hands of Lafayette. He was again what Madame de Staël had called him at an earlier day, master of events. It rested with him to choose. He might have made a Republic, of which he would have been acknowledged head. But, cautious of Public Order, which with him was next to Liberty, mindful of that moderation which he had always cultivated, and unwilling, if Liberty were safe, to provoke a civil contest, drenching France again in fraternal blood, he proposed "a popular throne surrounded by republican institutions," and the Duke of Orléans, under the name of Louis Philippe, became king. Clearly his own preference was for a Republic on the American model, but he yielded this cherished idea, satisfied that at last Liberty had pre-

[1] Ordre du Jour du 29 Juillet, 1830: Mémoires, Tom. VI. p. 391.

vailed, while peace was assured to his blood-stained country. If the republican throne fell short of his just expectations, it was because, against high injunction, he had put trust in princes.

The loftiness of his character was revealed, when, at a menace of violence by the excited populace, he issued a general order, as commander of the National Guard, announcing himself as "the man of Liberty and Public Order, loving popularity far more than life, but determined to sacrifice both rather than fail in any duty and tolerate a crime, — persuaded that no end justifies means which public or private morals disown." [1]

Soon again he laid down his great command, contenting himself with his farm and his duties as deputy. But his heart went wherever Liberty was struggling, — now with the Pole, and then with the African slave. To the rights of the latter he had borne true and unfaltering loyalty at all times and in all places, beginning with that memorable appeal to Washington on the consummation of Independence, and repeated in two triumphal visits to our country, — also in public debate, in conversation, in correspondence, — in the interesting experiment at Cayenne, and, more affecting still, in the dungeon of arbitrary power. Every slave, according to him, has a natural right to immediate emancipation, whether by concession or force; and this principle he declared above all question.[2] He knew no distinction of color, as he continually showed. His first letter to President John Quincy Adams, after return from his American triumph, mentions that he had dined in the company of two commissioners from Hayti, one a mulatto and

[1] Ordre du Jour du 19 Décembre, 1830: Mémoires, Tom. VI. p. 491.
[2] Lettre à Thomas Clarkson, 11 Mai, 1823: Ibid., p. 159.

the other entirely black, and he was "well pleased with their good sense and good manners."[1] Tenderly he touched this great question in our own country; but his constancy in this respect shows how it haunted and perplexed him, like a Sphinx with a perpetual riddle. He could not understand how men who had fought for their own liberty could deny liberty to others. But he did not despair, although, on one occasion, when this inconsistency glared upon him, his impatient philanthropy exclaimed, that he would never have drawn his sword for America, had he known that it was to found a government sanctioning Slavery.

The time had come for this great life to close. A sudden illness, contracted in following on foot the funeral of a colleague, confined him to his bed. As his case became critical, the Chamber of Deputies, by solemn vote, — perhaps without example in parliamentary history, — directed their President to inquire of George Washington Lafayette after the health of his illustrious parent. On the following day, May 20, 1834, he died, aged seventy-seven.

The ruling passion of his life was strong to the close. As at the beginning, so at the end, he was all for Human Rights. This ruled his mind and filled his heart. His last public speech was in behalf of political refugees seeking shelter in France from the proscription of arbitrary power.[2] The last lines traced by his hand, even after the beginning of his fatal illness, attest his joy at that great act of Emancipation by which England had just given freedom to her slaves. "Nobly," he wrote, "has the public treasure been em-

[1] Mémoires, Tom. VI. p. 222.

[2] Ibid., p. 754, note.

ployed!"[1] And these last words still resound in our ears, speaking from his tomb.

Such was Lafayette. At the tidings of his death, there was mourning in two hemispheres, and the saying of Pericles seemed to be accomplished, that "To the illustrious the whole earth is a sepulchre."[2] It was felt that one had gone whose place was among the great names of history, combining the double fame of hero and martyr, heightened by the tenderness of personal attachment and gratitude. Nor could such example belong to France or America only. Living for all, his renown became the common property of the whole Human Family. The words of the poet were revived:—

> "Ne'er to these chambers where the mighty rest
> Since their foundation came a nobler guest;
> Nor e'er was to the bowers of bliss conveyed
> A fairer spirit or more welcome shade."[3]

Judge him by the simple record of his life, and you will confess his greatness. Judge him by the motives of his conduct, and you will bend with reverence before him. More than any other man in history he is the impersonation of Liberty. His face is radiant with its glory, as his heart was filled with its sweetness. His was that new order of greatness destined soon to displace the old. Peculiar and original, he was without predecessors. Many will come after him, but there were none before him. He was founder, inventor, poet, as much

[1] Lettre à M. Murray, Président de la Société d'Émancipation des Noirs, à Glascow, 1 Mai, 1834: Mémoires, Tom. VI. p. 763, note.

[2] Funeral Oration over the first who fell in the Peloponnesian War: Thucydides, Hist., Book II. c. 43.

[3] Tickell, On the Death of Mr Addison, 43–46. Latterly these verses have been inscribed on the pavement of Westminster Abbey, over the resting-place of the author by whom they were originally inspired.

as if he had built a city, discovered ether, or composed an epic. On his foundation all mankind will build; through his discovery all will be aided; by his epic all will be uplifted. Early and intuitively he saw man as brother, and recognized the equal rights of all. Especially was he precocious in asserting the equal rights of the African slave. His supreme devotion to Humanity against all obstacles was ennobled by that divine constancy and uprightness which from youth's spring to the winter of venerable years made him always the same, — in youth showing the firmness of age, and in age showing the ardor of youth, — ever steady when others were fickle, ever faithful when others were false, — holding cheap all that birth, wealth, or power could bestow, — renouncing even the favor of fellow-citizens, which he loved so well, — content with virtue as his only nobility, — and whether placed on the dazzling heights of worldly ambition or plunged in the depths of a dungeon, always true to the same great principles, and making even the dungeon witness of his unequalled fidelity.

By the side of such sublime virtue what were his eminent French contemporaries? What was Mirabeau, with life sullied by impurity and dishonored by a bribe? What was Talleyrand, with heartless talent devoted to his personal success? What was Robespierre, with impracticable endeavors baptized in blood? What was Napoleon himself, whose surpassing powers to fix fortune by profound combinations, or to seize it with irresistible arm, were debased by the brutality of selfishness? These are the four chief characters of the Revolution, already dropping from the firmament as men learn to appreciate those principles by which Humanity is advanced. Lafayette ascends as they disappear, while

the world hails that Universal Enfranchisement which he served so well. As the mighty triumph is achieved, which he clearly foresaw, immense will be his reward among men.

Great he was, indeed, — not as author, although he has written what we are glad to read, — not as orator, although he has spoken much and well, — not as soldier, although he displayed both bravery and military genius, — not even as statesman, versed in the science of government, although he saw instinctively the relations of men to government. Nor did his sympathetic nature possess the power always to curb the passions of men, or to hurl the bolts by which wickedness is driven back. Not on these accounts is he great. Call him less a force than an influence, less "king of men" than servant of Humanity, — his name is destined to be a spell beyond that of any king, while it shines aloft like a star. Great he is as one of earth's benefactors, possessing in largest measure that best gift from God to man, the genius of beneficence sustained to the last by perfect honesty; great, too, he is as an early, constant Republican, who saw the beauty and practicability of Republican Institutions as the expression of a true civilization, and upheld them always; and great he is as example, which, so long as history endures, must inspire author, orator, soldier, and statesman all alike to labor, and, if need be, to suffer for Human Rights. The fame of such a character, brightening with the Progress of Humanity, can be measured only by the limits of a world's gratitude and the bounds of time.

APPENDIX.

AN incident in connection with the delivery of this address at Philadelphia illustrates the sensitive condition of the public mind at the time. Mr. Sumner was announced to give it before "The People's Literary Institute," when he received a letter from the President of the Institute, which will be understood by his reply.

"SENATE CHAMBER, December 19, 1860.

"DEAR SIR, — I have been honored by your official communication as President of the People's Literary Institute of Philadelphia, bearing date 17th December, in which you say, 'that the patrons of the Institute are persons of all shades of political opinion, and that in the present excited state of the public mind it is desirable that Slavery and Antislavery should not be touched by its lecturers.' This is written to govern me on the evening of the 27th of December, when, according to invitation, I was to address the Institute.

"With much misgiving I accepted the place urged upon me in your course. For some time I declined it, and yielded only to the most pressing solicitation. Afterwards, in reply to an inquiry from one of your officers, I let it be known that my subject would be 'Lafayette,' and I think you have already announced the same in your course. You are too familiar with the career of this constant friend of Human Freedom not to know that it cannot be adequately presented without touching upon the topics which you forbid. It was the peculiar glory of this illustrious man, that from his early days to his death-bed he strove always for Human Freedom, and especially sought to remove the intolerable evil of African Slavery. To leave so great a part of his life untouched would be an infidelity I cannot commit. Indeed, I do not think your careful judgment could approve such an act. If at any other time it might be done, you will see that at this moment, when persons acting in behalf of Slavery openly threaten *treason*, silence upon testimony so powerful would be nearly akin to complicity with the treason. The pirates of the Caribbean Sea are said to have carefully recited the Ten Commandments, omitting 'Thou shalt not steal.' A precedent like this I have no disposition to follow.

"Even if the subject of my lecture did not require me to infringe your instructions, I beg to assure you that I could not consent to speak under any such constraint. For many years I have addressed associations, societies,

and meetings of all kinds; but never before have I been met by any hint of interference with the completest latitude of speech, according to my sense of the duties and proprieties of the occasion. Long accustomed to free speech, I am too old now to renounce it.

"There are two recent events in Philadelphia which furnish a commentary upon your letter. The first is a resolution adopted at a public meeting, with the Mayor in the chair, openly proclaiming that free speech must not be permitted at the North; and the other is a practical illustration of this tyranny in the refusal to hear the accomplished Mr. Curtis, when announced to lecture before your Institute on 'The Policy of Honesty.' All this is done for the sake of Slavery, and in the hope of soothing traitors. You can know little of me, if you suppose that I can take part in any such work. Of course my place in your list is now vacant.

"I observe that your letter, although signed officially as President of the People's Institute, is marked '*Confidential.*' I have no desire to draw your name into any public discussion; but it is obvious that my refusal to take part in your course cannot be frankly stated without reference to what you have written.

"I have the honor to be, dear Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"CHARLES SUMNER.

"———— ————,

"President of the People's Literary Institute, Philadelphia."

December 22, Mr. Sumner received from the President of the Institute the following telegram: —

"Permit me to withdraw my letter. Come and speak freely. Do not decline. I have written you to-day."

This was followed by a letter from the President, repeating his request, and saying, among other things, —

"That the public are very desirous to hear you, and will be greatly disappointed, if you cancel the engagement.

"That, in common with the Managers and patrons of the Institute, I earnestly hope that you will reconsider your determination not to speak on the 27th instant, and that you will consent to deliver the lecture on 'Lafayette,' which has been advertised, and which the people expect, without any feeling of constraint as to the treatment of the subject."

Accordingly, December 27, Mr. Sumner spoke for the first time in Philadelphia. A few sentences from the *Press* show how he was received.

"The announcement that Hon. Charles Sumner would lecture at Concert Hall, before the People's Literary Institute, last evening, attracted an immense audience. At an early hour the hall was filled to its utmost sitting and standing capacity, and there must have been enough turned away, after

the sale of tickets was discontinued at the door, to have filled another hall of equal size. The audience was also of the most respectable character. . . . .

"When the lecturer entered the platform, he was greeted with uproarious applause. For several minutes the audience — the greater part of whom rose to receive him — continued clapping, cheering, and waving their handkerchiefs. . . . .

"He was introduced to the audience by President Allen, of Girard College, who said that the scholar, the eloquent orator, and the steadfast friend of man, all found a synonym in the name of the statesman who was now to address them; and his subject was suggestive to all lovers of Liberty. He had now the pleasure of introducing the Hon. Charles Sumner, who was to speak on Lafayette. The lecture which followed occupied two hours and a quarter in its delivery, and was given without notes."

The address on Lafayette was the last of a series during the year, by which Mr. Sumner had striven to direct public opinion against Slavery, so at least that it should not be carried into the Territories. Amidst hostile criticism there were friendly expressions, showing that he had not spoken in vain. Of these, one is presented as applicable to the series. It is the Dedication of the Thanksgiving Sermon, Sunday Evening, November 11, 1860, by Rev. Gilbert Haven, entitled, "The Cause and Consequence of the Election of Abraham Lincoln."

"TO THE HON. CHARLES SUMNER:

"Who has spoken the bravest words for Liberty in the most perilous places; who has suffered in behalf of the Slave only less than those who wear the martyr's crown; who has come forth from that suffering with the profoundest, because experimental, sympathy with the Oppressed, with a more intense hatred of the Oppression, yet without any bitterness of heart against the Oppressor; who will stand forth in the future times as the clearest-eyed, boldest-tongued, and purest-hearted Statesman of the age: these few words of Thanksgiving and Praise, for the manifestation of the Presence and Power of the ALMIGHTY REDEEMER in this greatest work of our time, are most respectfully dedicated."

DISUNION AND A SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY: THE OBJECT.

REMARKS IN THE SENATE, DECEMBER 10, 1860.

THE opening of Congress was signalized by two things: first, the Message of President Buchanan, December 4, 1860, misrepresenting the North, and practically abdicating the power to control rebellious States; and, secondly, the development of a determination on the part of certain States at the South to secede from the Union. Here South Carolina took the lead.

In the Senate, December 6th, Mr. Powell, of Kentucky, brought forward a resolution, which, after modification by himself, was as follows.

"*Resolved*, That so much of the President's Message as relates to the present agitated and distracted condition of the country, and the grievances between the slaveholding and the non-slaveholding States, be referred to a special committee of thirteen members, and that said committee be instructed to inquire into the present condition of the country and report by bill or otherwise."

In the consideration of this resolution a debate ensued on the state of the Union, and the resolution was adopted December 18th. The committee appointed by the Vice-President, Mr. Breckinridge, was Mr. Powell of Kentucky, the mover, Mr. Hunter of Virginia, Mr. Crittenden of Kentucky, Mr. Seward of New York, Mr. Toombs of Georgia, Mr. Douglas of Illinois, Mr. Collamer of Vermont, Mr. Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, Mr. Wade of Ohio, Mr. Bigler of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rice of Minnesota, Mr. Doolittle of Wisconsin, and Mr. Grimes of Iowa. December 31st, Mr. Powell reported to the Senate "that the Committee have not been able to agree upon any general plan of adjustment" In the propositions offered in committee by Mr. Douglas we first meet that for the disfranchisement of the colored race, even where already voters, which was part of the Crittenden Compromise in its final form.[1]

[1] McPherson's Political History of the United States during the Great Rebellion, p. 72.

Immediately after the first reading of Mr. Powell's resolution for the appointment of a committee Mr. Sumner spoke as follows.

MR. PRESIDENT, — I have no desire to make a speech at this time, nor to take any part in the discussion that has commenced. I can bear yet a little longer the misrepresentations in the President's Message, and I believe the North can bear them yet a little longer. The time will come, perhaps, when I shall deem it my duty to set forth those things in the light of reason and of history; meanwhile I content myself with simply offering to the Senate testimony of direct and most authoritative bearing upon the present state of the Union. If I may adopt the language of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS], it will help us to make the diagnosis of the present disease in the body politic.

I hold in my hand an unpublished autograph letter, written by General Jackson while President of the United States, and addressed to a clergyman in a slave-holding State. Omitting certain sentences which are of a purely private nature, the letter is as follows.

"[*Private.*] "WASHINGTON, May 1, 1833.

"MY DEAR SIR, — . . . . I have had a laborious task here, but Nullification is dead; and its actors and courtiers will only be remembered by the people to be execrated for their wicked designs to sever and destroy the only good government on the globe, and that prosperity and happiness we enjoy over every other portion of the world. Haman's gallows ought to be the fate of all such ambitious men, who would involve their country in civil war, and all the evils in its train, that they might reign and ride on its whirlwinds and direct the storm. The free people of these

United States have spoken, and consigned these wicked demagogues to their proper doom. Take care of your Nullifiers; you have them among you; let them meet with the indignant frowns of every man who loves his country. The Tariff, it is *now*" —

and he underscores, or italicizes, the word "now" —

"known, was a mere pretext. Its burden was on your coarse woollens. By the law of July, 1832, coarse woollen was reduced to five per cent for the benefit of the South. Mr. Clay's bill takes it up and classes it with woollens at fifty per cent, reduces it gradually down to twenty per cent, and there it is to remain, and Mr. Calhoun and all the Nullifiers agree to the principle. The cash duties and home valuation will be equal to fifteen per cent more, and after the year 1842 you pay on coarse woollens thirty-five per cent. If this is not protection, I cannot understand; therefore the Tariff was only the pretext, and Disunion and a Southern Confederacy the real object. The next pretext will be the Negro or Slavery Question.

"My health is not good, but is improving a little. Present me kindly to your lady and family, and believe me to be your friend. I will always be happy to hear from you.

"ANDREW JACKSON.

"THE REV. ANDREW J. CRAWFORD."[1]

Here is the original autograph letter, in the well-known, unmistakable, bold, broad handwriting. [*Here Mr. Sumner held the letter up.*] These are the words of a patriot slaveholder of Tennessee, addressed to a

[1] This testimony was an evident surprise at the time. The venerable F. P. Blair, of Silver Spring, heard it from the gallery of the Senate, and expressed himself most confidently with regard to its importance and probable influence. But the plot had gone too far. Shortly afterwards the autograph letter was destroyed by the person to whom it was addressed, but not until after it had been photographed in Boston.

patriot clergyman of a slaveholding State, and they are directly applicable to the present hour. Of practical sense, of inflexible purpose, and of various experience, Andrew Jackson saw intuitively the springs and motives of human conduct, while he loved his country with a firm and all-embracing attachment. Thus inspired, he was able to judge the present and to discern the future. The Tariff, in his opinion, was a pretext only, — Disunion and a Southern Confederacy the real object. "The next pretext," says he, — and you, Sir, cannot fail to mark the words, — "will be the Negro or Slavery Question." These, Sir, are his words, not mine. Such is his emphatic judgment. Words and judgment now belong to history; nor can they be assailed without assailing one of the greatest examples that a slaveholding community has given to our common country.

ATTEMPT AT COMPROMISE: THE CRITTENDEN PROPOSITIONS.

INCIDENTS AND NOTES, DECEMBER 18, 1860, TO MARCH 4, 1861.

BEFORE the organization of the Committee of Thirteen on the State of the Union, mentioned in the preceding article, Mr. Crittenden brought forward a joint resolution, December 18, 1860, containing propositions of Compromise, which soon became known by the name of their author. These propositions were extensive in character, covering amendments to the Constitution and recommendations to the States. Afterwards, January 3, 1861, he reintroduced his propositions, with a new preamble, and with two additional amendments to the Constitution. That such propositions could have been seriously presented as a basis of Union shows the exacting spirit of Slavery, and the deplorable insensibility to great principles.

The Compromise in its final form opened with a Constitutional prohibition of Slavery in all territory of the United States north of 36° 30′, but on the other hand it was expressly declared that "in all the territory now held, or hereafter to be acquired, south of said line of latitude, *Slavery of the African race is hereby recognized as existing*, and shall not be interfered with by Congress, but shall be protected as property by all the departments of the Territorial Government during its continu-

ance"; and any territory north or south of this line was to be admitted into the Union as a State with or without Slavery, as the Constitution of such new State might provide. It was further declared that Congress should have no power to abolish Slavery in places under its exclusive jurisdiction and within the limits of slave-holding States; that Congress should have no power to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, so long as it exists in the adjoining States of Virginia and Maryland, or either, nor without the consent of the inhabitants, nor without just compensation to slave-owners who do not consent to such abolishment; that Congress should not prohibit officers of the Federal [National] Government, or Members of Congress, whose duties require them to be in the District, from bringing with them their slaves and holding them as such; and that Congress should have no power to prohibit or hinder the transportation of slaves from one State to another, or to a Territory in which slaves are by law permitted to be held, whether that transportation be by land, navigable rivers, or by sea.

Then followed Constitutional amendments, providing that the United States should pay to the owner of a fugitive slave the full value of such slave, in case of obstruction to the recovery thereof, — also providing that no future amendment of the Constitution should affect these articles, or the existing provisions relating to slave representation and the surrender of fugitives from service, or give to Congress any power to abolish or interfere with Slavery in any of the States where it exists.

Then followed another Constitutional amendment, providing that "the elective franchise and the right to hold office, whether Federal [National], State, Terri-

torial, or municipal, shall not be exercised by persons who are in whole or in part of the African race," — and still another, providing for the acquisition of "districts of country in Africa and South America" for the colonization of "free negroes and mulattoes."[1]

Besides these amendments to the Constitution, the joint resolution, in order "to remove all just cause for the popular discontent and agitation which now disturb the peace of the country and threaten the stability of its institutions," proceeded to declare, that the laws now in force for the recovery of fugitive slaves are in strict pursuance of the plain and mandatory provisions of the Constitution, that the slaveholding States are entitled to their faithful observance and execution, and that laws should be made for the punishment of those who illegally interfere to prevent their execution, — that State laws interfering with the recovery of fugitive slaves (referring to Personal Liberty Laws) should be repealed, that the Fugitive Slave Act of September 18, 1850, should be amended in certain particulars, and that the laws for the suppression of the African Slave-Trade should be made effectual.

[1] These two were in the series of January 3, 1861, and according to Mr. Crittenden were "proposed by the honorable Senator from Illinois" (Mr. Douglas), although nothing in the *Congressional Globe* shows that the propositions of Mr. Douglas offered to the Committee of Thirteen (*ante*, p. 433) were ever before proposed in the Senate. Whatever their origin, they were adopted by Mr. Crittenden, and became part of his Compromise. Of the original copies printed for the Senate only a single copy *containing the important additions* remains on the files. The propositions in their first form are in the *Globe*, under date of December 18, 1860, p. 114, also in McPherson's *Political History of the Rebellion*, pp. 64, 65. They do not appear in the *Globe* on reintroduction with additions, January 3, 1861, p. 237, but the first addition is found at a later date, March 2, 1861, p. 1368, when they were voted on. Nor do the additions appear in McPherson's History. It is proper that the disfranchisement of the colored race, where already voters, should not be forgotten as one of the terms of this sacrifice.

The Crittenden Compromise was encountered in the Senate by the following counter propositions, offered by Mr. Clark, of New Hampshire, January 9, 1861.

"*Resolved*, That the provisions of the Constitution are ample for the preservation of the Union and the protection of all the material interests of the country; that it needs to be obeyed rather than amended; and that an extrication from the present dangers is to be looked for in strenuous efforts to preserve the peace, protect the public property, and enforce the laws, rather than in new guaranties for particular interests, compromises for particular difficulties, or concessions to unreasonable demands.

"*Resolved*, That all attempts to dissolve the present Union, or overthrow or abandon the present Constitution, with the hope or expectation of constructing a new one, are dangerous, illusory, and destructive; that in the opinion of the Senate of the United States no such reconstruction is practicable; and therefore to the maintenance of the existing Union and Constitution should be directed all the energies of all the departments of the Government, and the efforts of all good citizens."

January 16, the question being taken by yeas and nays, on the motion to substitute, resulted, yeas 25, nays 23, as follows.

Yeas, — Messrs. Anthony, Baker, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hall, Harlan, King, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, Wilson, — 25.

Nays, — Messrs. Bayard, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Clingman, Crittenden, Fitch, Green, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Saulsbury, Sebastian, — 23.

So the amendment was agreed to, and the proposition of Mr. Clark was substituted for that of Mr. Crittenden.

This important result, by which the Crittenden Compromise received a heavy blow, was a surprise, brought about by the Senators of the Gulf States, — Iverson of Georgia, Clay and Fitzpatrick of Alabama, Brown and Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, Benjamin and Slidell of Louisiana, Mallory and Yulee of Florida, Hemphill and Wigfall of Texas, and Johnson of Arkansas, — who were in attendance, but withheld their votes. The two Senators of South Carolina, Hammond and Chesnut, also Toombs of Georgia, had not appeared in their seats during the session. Three of these Senators voting against the substitute, it could not have been carried, and the original propositions would have been still before the Senate. The adoption of the substitute was used by them to inflame their constituents. Their conduct on this occasion showed a "foregone conclusion." Nothing but Disunion would satisfy them, — not even the Crittenden Compromise, so full of surrender.

Then ensued a comedy. Immediately after the adoption of the substitute, a reconsideration of the vote was moved by Mr. Cameron, of Pennsylvania, at the request of Mr. Crittenden, which on a subsequent day was carried. The question was then allowed to sleep on the table, until, unexpectedly, on the last legislative day of the session, just before the expiration of the Congress, and after the withdrawal of the Southern Senators, it was called up by Mr. Mason, of Virginia, when Mr. Clark again offered his substitute, which was lost by a vote of 22 nays against 14 yeas, several Senators expressing a desire to vote directly on the original propo-

sitions. On these propositions the final vote stood, yeas 19, nays 20, as follows.

Yeas, — Messrs. Bayard, Bigler, Bright, Crittenden, Douglas, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Polk, Pugh, Rice, Sebastian, Thomson, Wigfall, — 19.

Nays, — Messrs. Anthony, Bingham, Chandler, Clark, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Harlan, King, Morrill, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, Wilson, — 20.

So the joint resolution of Mr. Crittenden, with its various propositions, was rejected. The final withdrawal of the Senators from seceding States obviously aided this result.

As the session was coming to a close, a joint resolution was received from the House of Representatives proposing yet another amendment to the Constitution, as follows.

"No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere within any State with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State."

Bills and joint resolutions must be read on three several days; but on ordinary occasions they receive their first and second readings the same day. Mr. Sumner, unwilling that this other attempt should be hurried through the Senate, objected to the second reading on the first day, and the next day had a question with Mr. Douglas on the correction of the Journal, which failed to record his objection. On his motion the Journal was corrected.[1] The Senate then suspended

[1] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 2d Sess., pp. 1338 – 1340, March 2, 1861.

the rule requiring the three readings of a Constitutional amendment on three separate days, and proceeded to the consideration of the proposed amendment. Mr. Pugh, of Ohio, spoke lightly of its composition, saying:—

"I think it was De Quincey who said, that, next to the duty which a man owes God and his country and his family, it was his duty to preserve the purity of his mother tongue. The Constitution of the United States is written in excellent English; but if this amendment be expressed in the English language, or by any rule of grammar, I do not understand it."

Mr. Crittenden replied, that he could "bear with bad English, when it expressed a good thing."

The vote on its passage was 24 yeas to 12 nays, as follows.

Yeas, — Messrs. Anthony, Baker, Bigler, Bright, Crittenden, Dixon, Douglas, Foster, Grimes, Gwin, Harlan, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Latham, Mason, Morrill, Nicholson, Polk, Pugh, Rice, Sebastian, Ten Eyck, Thomson, — 24.

Nays, — Messrs. Bingham, Chandler, Clark, Doolittle, Durkee, Foot, King, Sumner, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, Wilson, — 12.

Two thirds of the Senate present voting for the joint resolution, it was agreed to. The proposed amendment to the Constitution was never adopted by the States. It remains in the national archives, a singular instance of bad composition, and the monument of a fruitless effort.

This final attempt to appease the spirit of Rebellion was on the last legislative day of the session. The 3d of March being Sunday, the Senate, without adjourning,

took a recess from Saturday evening till Sunday evening at seven o'clock, thus making the 2d of March the concluding day of that Congress, which was prolonged till noon of March 4th. During the sitting of Sunday, from seven o'clock in the evening till midnight, Mr. Sumner, who had never been in the habit of pairing, was induced to pair with Mr. Polk, of Missouri, who was unwilling to transact business on Sunday. His scruples did not prevent him from joining the Rebellion, for which he was subsequently expelled from the Senate on Mr. Sumner's motion.

The Crittenden Compromise attracted attention not only in Congress, but throughout the country.

Meanwhile a Boston committee arrived at Washington, composed of leading citizens, with Hon. Edward Everett as chairman, to urge an adjustment by mutual surrender. Mr. Everett called upon Mr. Sumner at his lodgings, and with much emotion urged him to bring forward some conciliatory proposition, saying, "You are the only person who can introduce such a proposition with chance of success." Mr. Sumner replied: "You are mistaken in supposing that I might have success with compromise, if I could bring it forward. If I am strong with the North, it is because of the conviction that I cannot compromise; but the moment I compromised, I, too, should be lost."

All in Massachusetts were not like this committee. The tone of many was expressed by a venerable citizen, and an able writer, connected with the press during a long life, Joseph T. Buckingham, who closed a firm and courageous letter, under date of January 11, 1861, with the words,—

"God bless *you*, and *all* who keep a stiff backbone! For those who yield, I care not what becomes of them."

On the 19th of January, 1861, the General Assembly of Virginia adopted a series of resolutions, proposing a Convention of States at Washington, February 4, 1861, to attempt an adjustment of the pending difficulties, and recommending the propositions of Mr. Crittenden reinforced. The action of the Virginia Assembly was communicated to the Senate by message of President Buchanan, January 28th. Mr. Sumner, being against all compromise, could not regard with favor any attempt in that direction. A misrepresentation of his position was corrected by the following telegram in Northern papers.

"WASHINGTON, January 30, 1861.

"The report, that Senator Sumner has approved the objects of the Convention which is to assemble here at the call of Virginia, is a mistake. Mr. Sumner regards that call as part of the treasonable conspiracy against the National Government, and does not see how Northern men can have anything to do with it, unless they are ready in some way to play into the hands of the traitors.

"Mr. Sumner has always held that any change by the North from its attitude of firmness and repose can have no other effect than the encouragement of treason."

A telegraphic correspondence further shows his position.

"BOSTON, January 31, 1861.

"HON. CHARLES SUMNER:—

"Do you favor sending Commissioners to Washington 4th February?

"GEORGE L. STEARNS."

"WASHINGTON, January 31, 1861.

"GEORGE L. STEARNS, Esq., Boston: —

"I am against sending Commissioners to treat for the surrender of the North. Stand firm.

"CHARLES SUMNER."

Alone of the Massachusetts delegation Mr. Sumner declined to unite with his colleagues in recommending to the Governor the appointment of Commissioners. This isolation was the occasion of a report which is mentioned in a letter of S. M. Booth, written, under date of February 2d, from his prison at Milwaukee, where he was suffering for aiding a fugitive slave.

"The telegraph assigns you the enviable position of standing 'solitary and alone' among the Massachusetts representatives, as inflexibly opposed to compromise with rebels for the benefit of Slavery. I cannot believe you are so entirely forsaken, yet I greatly fear the country is to be dishonored and the Republican party dissolved. . . . . Rest assured that the masses of the Republican party do not sympathize with the Compromisers of the Republican party, nor appreciate that statesmanship which consists in yielding vital principles to the demands of the Slave Power. The 'Barbarism of Slavery' is now demonstrated before 'all Israel and the sun.' I see little good to come from the election of Lincoln, if the platform of the opposing candidates is to be adopted by the Republican leaders. Indeed, it were far better that Slavery should triumph under the rule of Douglas or Breckinridge than under the rule of Lincoln."

So Mr. Sumner thought, and he acted accordingly. His correspondence with Governor Andrew at this time was constant and earnest. The latter was resolute

against Compromise. In a letter of January 20th, the Governor wrote: —

"From war, pestilence, and famine, from all assaults of the world, the flesh, and the Devil, good Lord, deliver us, — but most especially from any compromise with traitors, or any bargain with Slavery!"

Under date of January 30th, the Governor wrote: —

"I think we had better be present by good men in the Conference, if there is to be one, than to be misrepresented by volunteers, or be wholly outside, unheard, and misinformed of the plans and doings inside. Our Committee on Federal Relations will report good resolutions, I think, which will leave us free of complicity with the heresy of the Virginia resolutions, and secure the dignity and fairness of our position."

Another letter from Massachusetts said, that, if Massachusetts did not send representatives, "the Boston Hunkers would send a delegation, which would not be desirable."

The Commissioners appointed by the Governor were, John Z. Goodrich, Charles Allen, George S. Boutwell, Francis B. Crowninshield, Theophilus P. Chandler, John M. Forbes, and Richard P. Waters, — all firm against any new concession to Slavery.

Against their influence and votes, the Convention, known as the "Peace Congress," presented a series of propositions similar in character and surrender to those of Mr. Crittenden, sharing also a similar fate.

During these various efforts, President Buchanan was earnest for the Crittenden Compromise. An interview of Mr. Sumner with him, reported in the Northern papers, shows his desire for this terrible concession.

"WASHINGTON, February 4.

"Much interest is manifested in the interview between President Buchanan and Senator Sumner. Mr. Sumner visited the President, at the request of Governor Andrew, to learn his answer to the Massachusetts offer of military aid; that done, Mr. Sumner said, —

"What else can Massachusetts do for the good of the country?

"Mr. BUCHANAN. A great deal. No State more.

"Mr. SUMNER. I should like to know what.

"Mr. BUCHANAN (after a pause). Adopt the Crittenden propositions.

"Mr. SUMNER. Is that necessary?

"Mr. BUCHANAN. It is.

"Mr. SUMNER. Massachusetts has not acted directly on these propositions, which seek to give Slavery Constitutional protection in Territories, and disfranchise large numbers of her citizens; but I believe such are the convictions of the Massachusetts people that they would never consent to any such thing.

"Mr. Sumner repeated his assurance in the strongest language.

"The President said he felt discouraged by the reply.

"Mr. Sumner spoke of the common ground where all who truly loved the country could stand. It was the Constitution as administered by Washington. The verdict of the people last November should be recognized without price or condition.

"The President said he and Mr. Sumner must differ politically.

"Mr. Sumner assured the President that the people of Massachusetts were attached to the Union; that real disunionists there might all be put in an omnibus; but Massachusetts could not be brought to sacrifice or abandon her principles, and in that he sincerely joined."

This interview was described by Mr. Sumner in one of his familiar letters to Governor Andrew, which is copied from the private files of the latter.

WASHINGTON, February 3, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — I saw the President yesterday. He was astonished to learn that the resolutions had not been acknowledged, and said that it should be done.

Afterwards I said to him, "Mr. President, what else can we do in Massachusetts for the good of the country?" A pause. "Much, Mr. Sumner." "What?" said I. "Adopt the Crittenden propositions," said he. "Is that necessary?" said I. "Yes," said he. To which I replied, "Massachusetts has not yet spoken directly; but I feel authorized to say, that, such are the unalterable convictions of her people, they would see their State sunk below the sea, and turned into a sand-bank, before they would adopt propositions acknowledging *property in men*, and disfranchising a portion of her population." I think I was right.

In God's name stand firm! *Don't cave*, Andrew! God bless you!

CHARLES SUMNER.

Save Massachusetts from any "surrender," THE LEAST!

C. S.

The latter part of the letter alluded to reports that the Legislature was disposed to repeal or modify the well-known laws for the protection of Personal Liberty, passed originally as a defence against the Fugitive Slave Bill. Compromisers urged this surrender, particularly after the special call in the Crittenden propositions. At

the request of anxious citizens at home, Mr. Sumner wrote to members of the Legislature against any such sacrifice, insisting, that, with the manifest determination of the South, it could do no good, while plainly the laws should be maintained for the sake of Liberty. His views were briefly expressed in a private letter to Hon. William Claflin, Chairman of the Republican State Committee, and President of the Massachusetts Senate.

[*Private.*] WASHINGTON, January 1, 1860.

MY DEAR CLAFLIN, — Massachusetts has now an important post. Her most difficult duty is to be true to herself and her own noble history. In the name of Liberty, I supplicate you not to let her take any backward step, — *not an inch, not a hair's breadth.*

It is now too late for any fancied advantage from such conduct. The crisis is too far advanced. It only remains that she do nothing by which Liberty suffers, or her principles are recanted.

Remember well, that not a word from our Legislature can have the least influence in averting the impending result. What the case requires is firmness which nothing can shake.

Let the timid cry, but let Massachusetts stand stiff. God bless her!

We are on the eve of great events, and this month will try men's souls. But our duty is clear as noonday, and bright as the sun.

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

In a letter dated January 15, Governor Andrew suggested a communication from the Massachusetts dele-

gation, "that it is not important or desirable that we should repeal the Personal Liberty Laws." February 17th, he announces, with something of exultation, the unanimous report of the Committee of the Legislature in harmony with his ideas.

"I had no original expectation of getting such a result; but I told some persons that they could not get anything *through this room* [the Council Chamber] not conformable to certain principles, and which did not contain certain details, unless they marched it through by dragoons."

A letter from Hon. D. W. Alvord, written from Greenfield, Massachusetts, refers to the action of Mr. Sumner.

"Those who believe that it is the first duty of a State to protect its citizens from oppression, as much when the oppression is threatened by the General Government as when it comes from any other quarter, owe you especial thanks. Your influence has saved the 'Personal Liberty Laws' of this State from essential change. Such change would have been strenuously resisted by many true men in the Legislature, even had your advice been different; but your letters, shown about among members, and the knowledge spread through the Legislature that you advised against repeal or essential modification, stiffened many weak backs, and rendered any great change impossible."

Thus at home, in the Legislature, as well as in Congress, people were busy to find some form of surrender inconsistent with those principles which had triumphed at the Presidential election. Mr. Sumner was positive against any surrender anywhere. A letter to Count Gurowski, in New York, which has seen the light since his death, is a contemporary record.

WASHINGTON, January 8, 1861.

MY DEAR COUNT, — Sunday evening I had a visit from Thurlow Weed and Seward. The former said that he found himself "alone," — nobody united with him. I rejoiced. —— and —— are here from New York for the same object. They urge that we cannot have a united North, unless we make an effort for adjustment; to which I reply: "We have the verdict of the people last November: that is enough."

But these compromisers do not comprehend the glory of a principle. *Périssent les colonies plutôt qu'un principe!* That exclamation exalts a period which has many things to be deplored.

The Slave States are mad. They will all move. Nothing now but abject humiliation on the part of the North can stay them. Nobody can foresee precisely all that is in the future, but I do not doubt that any conflict will precipitate the doom of Slavery. It will probably go down in blood. . . . .

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

During these efforts at compromise, the conspirators proceeded in their work. South Carolina took the lead, adopted an Ordinance of Secession December 20, 1860, and shortly thereafter raised the Palmetto flag over the custom-house and post-office at Charleston. Mississippi followed, January 9, 1861; Florida, January 10; Alabama, January 11; Georgia, January 19; and Louisiana, January 26. January 21st the Senators of seceding States withdrew from the Senate. Texas was not declared out of the Union until March 4th, when her Senators withdrew.

Another event will properly close this sketch. At the end of December, 1860, Commissioners from South Carolina arrived at Washington, in order to obtain the complete withdrawal of the national troops. Major Anderson, by a sudden movement, had transferred his command from Fort Moultrie to Fort Sumter, which was much easier to hold. Fort Moultrie and Castle Pinckney were at once occupied by the Rebels. The country was aroused, and insisted that Fort Sumter should not be abandoned. It was held, until, after a bombardment of thirty-four hours, it yielded, April 13, 1861.

ANXIETIES AND PROSPECTS DURING THE WINTER.

LETTERS TO JOHN A. ANDREW, GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS, JANUARY 17 TO FEBRUARY 20, 1861.

THE following letters to Governor Andrew were obviously written in the intimacy of personal friendship and under the spur of public duty. The constant appeals for firmness at home found sympathetic response in one who was himself always firm, and they helped him with others. A letter to Mr. Sumner, dated January 28th, shows his appreciation of the correspondence.

"I have had great satisfaction in your constant remembrance of me by letters, documents, &c. I bear always in my mind and on my heart the honor of the 'Old Bay State,' and the claims of our holy cause of Liberty upon my devotion and efforts. May God help us all to be faithful! . . . . I feel much support in your letters."

SENATE CHAMBER, January 17, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — Your timely suggestion with regard to Treasury notes I have referred to Mr. Sherman in the House, where any measure founded upon it must originate.

I have letters constantly from New York as well as Massachusetts, expressing great solicitude with regard to the safety of the capital. I am satisfied, that, had the President persevered in his original policy of surrender and treason, we should have been driven away before the 1st of February. Others with whom I converse do not doubt this. But General Scott has applied his best energies to measures of defence. He is sat-

isfied that the traitors cannot succeed here, whatever they may do elsewhere. He has force enough on hand to hold the capital for hours against any attack which can be expected, and within that time he can have fifty thousand men from the North. A law maxim says, *Cuique in sua arte credendum est.* Should he be mistaken, his military reputation will suffer terribly.

You see as well as I, that any military assistance must be invited by the Government. A march of troops on our side would be a "first move" towards hostilities. Our safety must depend upon the watchfulness of the Government. But I agree with Mr. Stearns, that it would be useful to have some faithful men here who would make it a business to ascertain the plans and purposes of the enemy.

Mr. Burleigh, a Republican of John Covode's district, has recently made an excursion into Maryland, where, passing himself as a speculator in negroes, he thinks he got into secrets. He reports a combination of ten thousand men to seize the capital, and also another conspiracy to assassinate Mr. Lincoln in Maryland, on his way to Washington.

Our friends are all tranquil, except so far as disturbed by Seward's speech. If his propositions were pressed, I think they would split the party. I regret very much that he made them, and I protested most earnestly against them. He read me his speech four days in advance of its delivery. I pleaded with him, for the sake of the cause, the country, and his own good name, to abandon all his propositions, and simply to declare that Mr. Lincoln would be inaugurated on the 4th of March President of the United States, and rally the country to his support. I do not think we should allow

this opportunity to pass without trying the question, whether a single State can break up the Union. What is it worth, if held by any such tenure? I have no concession or compromise of any kind to propose or favor; least of all can I become party to any proposition which sanctions Slavery directly or indirectly. I deplore everything of this kind, however plausible, as demoralizing to the country.

Pray keep Massachusetts sound and *firm* — FIRM — FIRM — against every word or step of concession. God bless you!

Ever and ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SENATE CHAMBER, January 18, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — I think that our friends are coming to the conclusion, that we can offer no terms of concession or compromise, in order to please the Border States. The question must be met on the Constitution *as it is* and the facts *as they are*, or we shall hereafter hold our Government subject to this asserted right of secession. Should we yield now, — and any offer is concession, — every Presidential election will be conducted with menace of secession by the defeated party.

There is a disposition to *stand firm* together. . . . .

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SENATE CHAMBER, January 21, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — Pray keep our beloved Com-

monwealth firm; yet a little longer and the crisis will be passed. Save her from surrender. Nothing she can do will stay secession. IMPOSSIBLE. Let her not write a shameful page in the history of Human Freedom. I feel strongly for her fame, her good name, her character, her example. In the future let it be said that Massachusetts did not waver in the cause for which she has done so much.

How easy it would be for me to give my life rather than have her take a single backward step!

God bless you!

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

There is tranquillity now with regard to the capital. General Scott feels safe, and others feel safe under his wing. Virginia, it is said, will surely go.

SENATE CHAMBER, January 23, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — You have doubtless received my telegram. I found General Scott with the Secretary of War, and read the letter you inclosed. They said at once that no such guns had been ordered by the National Government, and General Scott added that they were, without doubt, intended for Fort Sumter. He said they were "very formidable." He thought they were "already in a state of great forwardness." Of course you will see that Massachusetts does not "imp the wings" of Treason.

Yesterday, before receiving your letter, I passed an hour and a half with General Scott. He is not with-

out solicitude in regard to the capital. Information received yesterday confirms the idea that there is a widespread conspiracy. He will have one thousand men here, — three companies of flying artillery, two companies of infantry, and five companies from Fortress Monroe. The place of the latter at Fortress Monroe will be supplied by recruits from New York.

He cannot ride on horseback, but he proposes to accompany Mr. Lincoln on the 4th of March in a carriage with Commodore Stewart, each in his uniform.

Nothing that Massachusetts can do now can arrest one single State. There can be no other result except our own humiliation, and a bad example, which will be felt by all other States. If Massachusetts yields one hair's breadth, other States may yield an inch or foot, a furlong, or a mile. Pray keep the Legislature firm. Don't let them undo anything ever done for Freedom.

Good bye.

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SENATE CHAMBER, January 24, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — I have a suggestion to make which is in harmony with one of your recent letters.

Mr. Dix,[1] in his letter of 18th January, on the present resources of the country, says: "Before closing this communication, I wish to call your attention to the fact that there are deposited with twenty of the States, for safe-keeping, over $28,000,000 *belonging to the United States*, for the repayment of which the faith of these

[1] Secretary of the Treasury.

States is pledged by written instructions on file in this department."

Of course this money might be reclaimed; but the Secretary does not propose to do so. These liabilities may be made a basis of credit, if the States will volunteer to indorse or guaranty the Treasury notes of the Government to the extent of their respective liabilities.

I wish to suggest that our Legislature should at once volunteer this aid to the General Government. Without some assistance Mr. Lincoln will find the Treasury empty. Beyond this consideration, you will appreciate the influence of such an act of loyalty at this peculiar moment.

Mr. Seward writes to-day to the Governor of New York, and makes the same suggestion. Other Senators will do the same. General Wilson unites with me.

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

Wilson says he should like to see our State do this promptly.

WASHINGTON, January 26, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — Yesterday I was with the Attorney-General,[1] an able, experienced, Northern Democratic lawyer, with the instincts of our profession on the relation of cause and effect. He drew me into his room, but there were clerks there; opening the door into another room, there were clerks there, too; and then

[1] Hon. Edwin M. Stanton.

traversing five different rooms, he found them all occupied by clerks; when, opening the door into the entry, he told me he was "surrounded by Secessionists," who would report in an hour to the newspapers any interview between us, — that he must see me at some other time and place, — that everything was bad as could be, — that Virginia would certainly secede, — that the conspiracy there was the most wide-spread and perfect, — that all efforts to arrest it by offers of compromise, or by the circulation of Clemens's speech, were no more than that (snapping his fingers), — that Kentucky would surely follow, and Maryland, too. "Stop, Mr. Attorney," said I, "not so fast. I agree with you to this point, — Maryland would go, except for the complication of the National Capital, which the North will hold, and also the road to it."

Of course you will keep Massachusetts out of all these schemes. If you notice the proposition for a commission, say that it is summoned to make conditions which contemplate nothing less than surrender of cherished principles, so that she can have nothing to do with it.

My opinion has been fixed for a long time. All the Slave States will go, except Delaware, and perhaps Maryland and Missouri, — to remain with us Free States.

The mistake of many persons comes from this, — they do not see that we are in the midst of a revolution, where reason is dethroned, and passion rules instead. If this were a mere party contest, then the circulation of speeches and a few resolutions might do good. But what are such things in a revolution? As well attempt to hold a man-of-war in a tempest by a little anchor

borrowed from Jamaica Pond; and this is what I told the Boston Committee with regard to their petition.

I have but one prayer: Stand firm, keep every safeguard of Human Rights on our statute-book, and save Massachusetts glorious and true.

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SENATE CHAMBER, January 28, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — I did not unite with the delegation yesterday in recommending commissioners, and I think they signed without much reflection, certainly without any general conference.

My disposition in any matter not involving principle is to keep the delegation *a Unit*, and I certainly would not stand in the way now. Two things have been pressed, both entitled to consideration: first, in the absence of commissioners duly appointed, certain "Union-savers" from Massachusetts, accidentally here, will work into the Convention, and undertake to represent Massachusetts; and, secondly, it is important that Massachusetts should not be kept insulated. Both you can judge, and I shall defer to your judgment.

Preston King concurred with me as to the true policy of our States; but he did not think it worth while to interfere positively by writing to the Governor of New York.

Should you conclude to move, let two things be guarded: first, the principles, by having it known that Massachusetts has taken no step towards any acceptance of the resolutions which are made the implied

basis of the proposed Convention; and, secondly, the men, by designating only the firmest, in whom there is no possibility of concession or compromise, like ——, ——, ——, ——, ——, ——; but you know the men better than I do.

Last evening the Attorney-General was with me for a long time, till after midnight. I know from him what I cannot communicate. Suffice it to say, he does not think it probable — hardly possible — that we shall be here on the 4th of March. The President has been wrong again, and a scene has taken place which will be historic, but which I know in sacred confidence. General Scott is very anxious. It is feared that the department will be seized and occupied as forts. What then can be done by the General, surgeons, and flying artillery?

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SENATE CHAMBER, January 28, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — Mr. Dix has proposed a form of State guaranty to be used in New York. He thinks it advisable to have the forms alike in the different States.

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

I send a copy.

P. S. — *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.* Don't let these words be ever out of your mind, when you think of any proposition from the Slave-Masters.

They are all essentially false, with treason in their hearts, if not on their tongues. How can it be other-

wise? Slavery is a falsehood, and its supporters are all perverted and changed. Punic in faith, Punic in character, you are to meet all that they do or say with denial or distrust.

Mr. Everett reported to me some smooth words of John Tyler, which seem to have gone to the soul of the eloquent son of Massachusetts. "Don't trust him," said I, "he means to betray you."

I know these men, and see through their plot.

The time has not yet come to touch the chords which I wish to awaken. But I see my way clear. O God! let Massachusetts keep true. It is all I now ask.

SENATE CHAMBER, February 5, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — Ever remember, "Forewarned is forearmed." Since recent sincere propositions to defend the capital, I have had no fear except from a revolutionary movement in Maryland. That, as I have repeatedly said, will depend upon Virginia. The recent elections seem to show that she at least will take time. This postpones the danger contingent upon her course.

More than the loss of forts, arsenals, or the national capital, *I fear the loss of our principles.*

These are now in greatest danger. Our Northern Fort Sumter will be surrendered, if you are not aroused. In my view, the vacillation of the Republicans is more fatal than that of Buchanan.

Keep firm, and do not listen to any proposition.

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SENATE CHAMBER, February 6, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — It seems to me that nothing is gained for the Union by the Virginia election *except delay*, unless the North surrender everything. I have always trusted that the North would not, and therefore look to the secession of Virginia as impending, — sooner or later to occur.

This delay seems like a beneficent intervention of Providence to arrest the conflict, which a sudden movement would have precipitated. It suspends the revolutionary movement in Maryland, which was to begin the 18th, — five days after the Virginia Convention, — and thus gives security to the capital.

Since General Scott has become wakeful, and has received powers from the President, I have felt safe against everything but a revolutionary movement.

Be assured I will keep you advised. I shall scent the coming danger.

But do not be deceived by that fatal advice which sees nothing but peace and security in the recent elections.

Chase has just left me. He thinks there may be thirty Unionists *per se* in the Virginia Convention; all the rest *only conditionally*, — the condition being the resolutions on which the Massachusetts commissioners are to deliberate. Bah! A friend, who was with Mr. Rives this morning, tells me that he was very bitter against Johnson, of Tennessee, for his Union speech, and especially for saying "Secession is treason." He says that the persons called Unionists will be for secession, if the South cannot have "Constitutional guaranties." The course of such a person as Mr. Rives, who is said to be conservative, foreshadows the result.

I have just seen Colonel Ritchie: a most intelligent gentleman, who does honor to our Commonwealth, — God bless her! But the crisis is adjourned.

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

May we all be loyal and true, and never desert great principles!

SENATE CHAMBER, February 8, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — Last evening I was greeted by the first instalment of the commissioners. The rest I expect this morning.

Be assured, I shall do all that I can for their comfort and information. I am relieved to know that there is not a single weak joint in them. . . . .

I pray constantly for courage at home. Let Massachusetts be true and firm, and keep our friends from division.

The news from Virginia continues to reveal the same tendency, — secession, unless constitutional guaranties are secured for Slavery. Without some change, contrary to all legislative and other declarations, Virginia must go out.

I hope that our Legislature will not pause in offering its guaranty to the bonds of the National Government. It ought to be done at once.

Did I ever tell you how much I enjoyed and admired your old musket speech? It was well conceived and admirably done. I am glad that Theodore Parker's name is enrolled in the Capitol.

I find your commissioners noble, true, good characters, able to support Massachusetts.

God bless you!

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

WASHINGTON, February 10, 1861.

DEAR ANDREW, — It is much to be regretted that our State has hesitated so long in giving its indorsement to the United States bonds. Let us give Government the means of procuring money at once, and put her credit on its legs.

There is tranquillity now. The Peace Conference has not reached any point. It is evident that Virginia and the other Border States will have to decide the question, Which to choose, Union or Slavery? If they remain, it must be in subjection to the Constitution and the antislavery policy of the Fathers.

I do not tremble at anything from our opponents, whoever they may be, but from our friends.

The New York commissioners, the majority, are stiff and strong.

Every word of concession thus far has done infinite mischief, — first, by encouraging the Slave-Masters, and, secondly, by demoralizing our own friends, and filling them with doubt and distrust.

God bless you!

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SENATE CHAMBER, February 20, 1861.

MY DEAR ANDREW, — I lost no time in seeing the Attorney-General and placing your letter in his hands. At the same time I pressed the pardon. He will give the subject his best attention, but I thought he was rather fixed against it.

Nothing has occurred to change my view of our affairs. It seems to me that Virginia will secede. At all events, if you expect this result, you will be best prepared for the future.

The Peace Conference is like the Senate, — powerless to mature any system of harmony. And the question of enforcing the laws and retaking the forts, — in other words, *of our existence as a Government*, — when presented, must increase the discord.

If Mr. Lincoln *stands firm*, I do not doubt that our cause will be saved. All that we hear testifies to his character. *But he is a man.*

The heart-burnings and divisions showing themselves in our party a few weeks ago are now less active. Those fatal overtures will fall to the ground. Oh, that they never had been made!

God bless you!

Ever yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

NO SURRENDER OF THE NORTHERN FORTS.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON A MASSACHUSETTS PETITION IN FAVOR OF THE CRITTENDEN PROPOSITIONS, FEBRUARY 12, 1861.

DURING weary, anxious weeks, while the Rebellion was preparing, and Senators were leaving their seats to organize hostile governments, Mr. Sumner resisted appeals to speak. An earnest character in Philadelphia wrote to him, January 31st: —

"May we not look to have *you* speak once more for us, — as a statesman, not as a politician, — as a philanthropist, not as the representative of a prospective Cabinet? Mr. Sumner, you know that Kansas was yesterday admitted. God bless her, and God bless you, to whom under Him she owes her deliverance, and the country owes the turning of the balances *against* Slavery for all time to come. Now, if the whole country is on the eve of a similar struggle, why should we not know it and act accordingly?"

Another zealous friend, writing from Massachusetts on the same day, said: —

"Why do we not hear your voice uplifted, in this critical, this dangerous hour?"

It was hard to resist such appeals. But there were good friends, agreeing with Mr. Sumner, who counselled silence. An incident unexpectedly occurred which compelled him to speak, although briefly.

February 12, 1861, Mr. Crittenden presented a petition extensively signed by people of Massachusetts, where, after setting forth that "their sentiments towards the Union and towards their common country have been misrepresented and misunderstood," and further declaring themselves "willing that all parts of the country should have their full and equal rights under the Constitution, and recognizing in the propositions of Hon. J. J. Crittenden a basis of settlement which the North and the South may fairly and honorably accede to, and which is well calculated to restore peace to the country," the petitioners conclude by asking the adoption of these propositions. The petition purported to be from one hundred and eighty-two cities and towns of Massachusetts, and to be signed by twenty-two thousand three hundred and thirteen citizens of Massachusetts. In presenting

it, Mr. Crittenden remarked on the number of signatures in different towns, mentioning especially Natick, the home of Senator Wilson, and Boston, where there were more than fourteen thousand petitioners out of nineteen thousand voters. And he added, that he felt "peculiar and especial satisfaction" in presenting the petition.

On his motion the petition was laid on the table, which, under the rules of the Senate, cut off debate, when Mr. Sumner moved the printing of the petition, and on this motion spoke as follows.

MR. PRESIDENT, — As I desire to say a few words on the petition, I move that it be printed.

These petitioners, I perceive, ask you to adopt what are familiarly known as the Crittenden Propositions. Their best apology, Sir, for such a petition is their ignorance of the character of those propositions. Had they known what they are, I feel sure they could not have put their names to any such paper.

Those propositions go beyond the Breckinridge platform, already solemnly condemned by the American people in the election of Abraham Lincoln. If adopted, they set aside the Republican platform, while they foist into the National Constitution guaranties of Slavery which the framers of that instrument never sanctioned, — which Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Patrick Henry, and John Jay, according to the testimony of their lives and declared opinions, would have scorned to sanction; nor can there be any doubt, that, had such propositions been made the condition of Union, this Union could not have been formed.

Mr. Madison, in the Convention which framed the National Constitution, taught his fellow-countrymen that it is "wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there can be property in men."[1] What manly vigor

[1] Debates in the Federal Convention, August 25, 1787: Madison Papers, Vol. III. pp. 1420, 1430.

and loftiness inspired that warning! Now these propositions not only interpolate the forbidden idea, but, proceeding to its practical application, they run a visible black line at latitude 36° 30′, extending the protection of the Constitution itself over Slavery south of that line, and then, making the case yet more offensive and more impossible at the North, they carry it to all territory hereafter acquired, so that the flag of the Republic, as it moves southward, must always be the flag of Slavery, while every future acquisition in that direction must submit to the terrible doom, — and all this under irrepealable text of Constitution, which, by supplementary provision, is expressly placed beyond amendment. In an age of civilization this is bad, very bad; but they go further. There are to be new guaranties of Slavery in the National capital, and in other places within the National jurisdiction, — also in transporting slaves to States and Territories, — also a reinforcement of the Fugitive Slave Bill; and all these are so placed under Constitutional safeguard as to exceed the permanence of other provisions. Nor is even this all. As if to do something inconceivably repugnant to just principles, and especially obnoxious to the people of Massachusetts, it is proposed to despoil our colored fellow-citizens there of political franchises long time assured by the institutions of that Liberty-loving Commonwealth. Before the adoption of the National Constitution it was declared in Massachusetts that there could be no distinction of color at the ballot-box; and this rule of equality is to be sacrificed, while fellow-citizens are thrust out of rights which they have enjoyed for generations.

Sir, for these things, and others kindred, do these

petitioners now pray, insisting that they shall all be interpolated into the National Constitution, — while, in entire harmony with this unparalleled betrayal, those laws which have been established for the protection of Personal Liberty are to be set aside, that the Slave-Hunter may have free course. Such are things which in the judgment of these petitioners "the North and the South may honorably accede to," while, in consideration of these impossible sacrifices, the fee of the Fugitive Slave Commissioners is modified, and it is declared that the Slave-Trade shall not be revived. And this is the compromise for which Massachusetts people in such large numbers from cities and towns now pray!

I have infinite respect for the right of petition, and I hope always to promote the interests and to represent the just and proper wishes of my fellow-citizens; but I cannot hesitate to declare my unfeigned regret that these petitioners, uniting in such numbers, have missed the opportunity of demanding plainly and unequivocally, as lovers of the Union, two things, all-sufficient for the present crisis, with regard to which I might expect the sympathies of the Senator from Kentucky: first, that the Constitution of the United States, as administered by George Washington, shall be preserved intact and blameless in its text, with no tinkering for the sake of Slavery; and, secondly, that the verdict of the people last November, by which Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States, shall be enforced without price or condition. Here is a platform on which every patriot citizen can take his stand, having over him the stars of the Union. How much better than any proposition, scheme, or vain delusion of Compromise! On such ground, all who really love the

Union of their fathers, without an *if* or a *but*, can plant themselves.

I remember, Sir, that in the debate on the night of the passage of the Nebraska Bill, — it was at midnight, — I made the declaration that all future compromise was impossible.[1] Events now taking place verify this truth. It is obvious that existing difficulties can be arranged only on permanent principles of justice, freedom, and humanity. Any seeming settlement founded in abandonment of principles will be but a miserable patchwork, which cannot succeed. Only a short time ago the whole country was filled with shame and dismay, as the reports came to us of the surrender of the Southern forts; and when it was known that Fort Sumter, too, was about to be given up, a cry went forth from the popular heart, by which that fortress was saved, at least for the present. And now for the parallel. Propositions are brought forward by the Senator from Kentucky, and enforced by petition from my own State, calling upon the North to surrender its principles, — to surrender those impregnable principles of Human Rights which constitute our Northern forts. It is even proposed to surrender the principle of Freedom in the Territories, — the Fort Sumter of the North. I trust, Sir, that all these principles will yet be saved; but plainly their safety depends upon the people, and not upon a President; therefore must the people be heard, as in that cry from the heart which only a few days ago saved the other Fort Sumter, menaced by the representatives of Slavery. For myself, if I stand with many, with few, or alone, I have but one thing to say:

[1] See, *ante*, Vol. III. p. 343; also Congressional Globe, 33d Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 785.

"No surrender of the Fort Sumter of the North! No surrender of any of our Northern forts, — no, Sir, not one of them!"

Bankers and merchants of New York and Boston tell us that the Government shall not have money, if we do not surrender. Then again, Sir, do I appeal to the people. Surely the American people are not less patriotic than the French. They only want the opportunity to come forward and supply the necessities of the Government, as the latter, at the hint of their Emperor, came forward with money, all in small sums, for the support of that war which ended in the liberation of Italy. Our Government stands on the aggregate virtue and intelligence of the people. Not only the rich and fortunate, but the farmer, the mechanic, the laborer, every citizen truly loving his country, will contribute out of his daily life to uphold the Constitution and the flag. From these small sums, inspired by a generous patriotism, I am glad to believe we shall have a full treasury, even if bankers and merchants stand aloof.

There is but one thing now for the North to do: it is to stand firm. The testimony of a great national benefactor, who helped our country to Independence, should be heard, — I mean Lafayette, — who, in his old age, with experience ripened by time, contemplating the terrible Revolution which had convulsed France, as a surviving actor and a surviving sufferer, did not hesitate to announce from his seat in the Chamber of Deputies, after recognizing the unutterable calamities of that Revolution, that, according to his solemn judgment, they must be referred not so much to the bad passions of men as to those timid counsels which sought to sub-

stitute *Compromise* for *Principle*.[1] The venerable patriot may well speak to his American fellow-citizens now, and inspire them to stand firm against those timid counsels which would make any such fatal substitution.

Mr. Crittenden replied at some length, vindicating his propositions, and also the Massachusetts petitioners, who, he said, had been charged with "ignorance." In the course of the debate the following passage occurred.

MR. CRITTENDEN. If the propositions I offered, and which I offered with diffidence, are not adequate to the purpose, if they ask too much, why have not gentlemen moved to amend? Why has the honorable Senator sat here for one month and more, and proposed no amendment to the propositions which he now rises to condemn his constituents for approving?

MR. SUMNER. Will the Senator allow me to say that every time I could get an opportunity I have voted against his propositions? I have missed no opportunity, direct or indirect, of voting against them, from beginning to end, every line and every word.

MR. CRITTENDEN. I do not controvert that, Mr. President; it may be so; but that is not what I am asking of the gentleman. It is, that, if he desired union and conciliation at all, why did he not move to amend the propositions which he now condemns?

MR. SUMNER. I will answer the Senator: Because I thought there could be no basis of peace on the Senator's propositions, which are wrong in every respect, in every line, in every word. That is what I thought. I was for the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of our fathers, as administered by George Washington.

[1] Speech, March 8, 1820: Mémoires, Tom. VI. p. 70. *Ante*, p. 4.

MR. CRITTENDEN. If that was all true, and the gentleman desired an amicable settlement of the difficulties which now threaten the country, had he no proposition whatever to make?

MR. SUMNER. Certainly, — the proposition which I have already made, that the Constitution, as administered by George Washington, should be preserved pure and free from any amendment for the sake of Slavery.

MR. CRITTENDEN. Why did he not move that? Why did he sit sullen and silent here for one month or more, with his breast full of resentment? [*Applause in the galleries.*]

THE PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. FOSTER, of Connecticut]. Order will be preserved in the galleries, or they will be cleared immediately.

MR. CRITTENDEN. With such a spirit of opposition to, and thinking as he did of these resolutions, why did he not propose to strike them all out?

MR. SUMNER. Will the Senator let me answer?

MR. CRITTENDEN. Yes, I will.

MR. SUMNER. I did vote for the substitute of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CLARK] just as soon as it could come to a vote, and that expresses precisely my conviction. That vote displaced the Senator's propositions entirely.[1]

Before the debate closed, Mr. Sumner replied briefly.

MR. PRESIDENT, — I have no desire to prolong this debate, or to occupy the time of the Senate. I content myself with two remarks. The Senator from Kentucky is not aware of his own popularity in Massachusetts, of the extent to which his name is an authority there, of the willingness of the people there to adopt anything

[1] For Mr. Clark's substitute, see, *ante*, p. 440.

with the sanction of his respectable name. I do not think the distinguished Senator is aware of that fact; consequently he does not see how easily the people of Massachusetts might be seduced to adopt at sight a proposition brought forward by him, which otherwise they would at once reject. Now all that I suggest in regard to these petitioners is, that, under the lead of the distinguished Senator, they put their names to a petition which I am sure they did not, in all respects and in all its bearings, fully understand; and I must do them the justice to believe, that, had they known the true character of the propositions of the Senator, they would not have signed petitions for their adoption.

This is all on that point; but I wish to make one other remark. The Senator intimated, if I understood him aright, that his propositions, at least in his own mind, were not applicable to territory hereafter acquired.

MR. CRITTENDEN. No: I do not mean to be understood as saying that.

MR. SUMNER. I understood the Senator so.

MR. CRITTENDEN. I said I did not consider that proposition as an essential part of mine, — that I did not intend to insist upon it, if I found it would not be acceptable. I did not intend that that should be any obstacle to an adjustment, and I would propose to strike it out, if necessary.

MR. SUMNER. The Senator did not consider that an essential part; and yet in the Journal of the Senate, now before me, in the yeas and nays, I find his name recorded in the affirmative on introducing those words, "now held or hereafter to be acquired." Here is the record, — the name of the Senator from Kentucky an-

swering yea, when we were all asked to answer yea or nay.

This brief effort of Mr. Sumner at a critical moment found response, not only from his constituents, but from the North generally. In Massachusetts many made haste to testify that the petition praying for such a shameful surrender had been signed by large numbers without knowing its true character, — while the Common Council of Boston, then controlled by Compromisers, also made haste to censure Mr. Sumner, declaring, in formal resolution, that his assertion in the Senate with regard to the petitioners was "undignified, unbecoming a Senator and a citizen of Boston, and untrue."

As through this remarkable petition, and the speech of Mr. Crittenden in presenting it, Massachusetts was vouched for Slavery, a few witnesses may be properly adduced to show how the signatures were obtained, and also what was the real sentiment of the people there.

William Lloyd Garrison, always watchful for Human Rights, and knowing the wiles of Compromise, wrote from Boston : —

"For one, I desire to thank you for declaring in the Senate that the petition from Boston, asking for any compromise to propitiate the South, did not represent the sentiment even of the city, but was signed by multitudes ignorantly and recklessly, — the left hand not knowing what the right hand did. I wish it were in your power to have that list of names critically examined. I am quite sure that hundreds of names would be proved to be 'men of straw.' I have been told that the names of Wendell Phillips, Henry Ward Beecher, Theodore Parker (!),[1] and my own, were appended to it. This is possible, but hardly credible. Still, excepting the Border-Ruffian returns in Kansas, I do not believe there was ever a petition more impudently and fraudulently presented to a legislative assembly than the one from this city.

"I congratulate you upon being the special object of the *Courier's* malignant abuse. Do not fear of being fully sustained by Massachusetts in your boldest utterances ; and how posterity will decide is easily seen."

M. P. Kennard, an excellent citizen and business man, wrote from Boston : —

"The petition was placed in the lobby of our post-office, under the charge of a crier, who saluted every one who passed him with, 'Sign this petition?' — and it was thoughtlessly signed by men and boys, native and foreign."

Charles W. Slack, of the newspaper press, wrote from Boston : —

[1] He was already dead.

"You are entirely right relative to the signers of the Crittenden Petition. Boys, non-voters, foreigners, anybody, were taken, who could write a name. The city police canvassed all the out-of-the-way places, and took the names they could gather. . . . . Glad that you spoke as you did. We look to you to give the key-note. None knows Massachusetts better than you, and none will be more faithful to her, come weal or woe."

Dr. William J. Dale, afterwards the Surgeon-General of Massachusetts, wrote from Boston: —

"The other day a neighbor of ours, Mr. Brown, an intelligent citizen, a provision dealer, corner of Derne and Temple Streets, stopped me and said, 'If you ever write Mr. Sumner, tell him that I, with many others, signed that Crittenden Petition under an entire misapprehension.' Says he, 'I would cut off my right hand before it should sign so infamous a proposition.' That is the feeling among the middling-interest people. The so-called Union men assume the air and manner of slave-overseers. They have overdone the thing here."

J. Vincent Browne, afterwards Collector of Internal Revenue in the Essex District of Massachusetts, wrote from Salem: —

"At least twenty persons who signed the paper in this city have said to me, 'Why, Mr. Crittenden's propositions are merely to restore the Missouri Compromise. I was told so, when I signed.' When the *truth* was told them, as usual, they were *astonished*. And so men trifle with their rights, and are trifled with."

John Tappan, a venerable citizen, loving peace, but hating Slavery, and anxious that Massachusetts should be right, wrote from Boston: —

"I thank you for it, and believe it speaks the sentiments of a vast majority of *all parties* in this and the other New England States. The only reason assigned by some of the signers is, that it was not expected that it would pass as offered, but lead to some compromise.

"Be assured the heart of the Commonwealth is with you, and that, if ever we were called upon for firmness in maintaining our Constitutional rights, it is now; and although I pray God no blood may be shed in the conflict, yet submission to the demands of Slavery is not to be the alternative.

"I rejoice the conflict has come in my day, although, on the verge of fourscore, I may not live to see harmony restored."[1]

Rev. John Weiss, the eloquent preacher and author, wrote from Milton, Massachusetts: —

"Your little speech lies in the hand like an ingot, — dense and precious,

[1] Mr. Tappan died March 25, 1871, in the ninetieth year of his age.

and of the color which charms my eyes at least. Nothing can be truer than your statement, that multitudes of people do not know what they sign, when they indorse the Crittenden propositions. I, for one, had not read them till quite lately. They have not been freely ventilated in the newspapers. When, the other day, the Boston papers undertook to print them formally, people were shocked. . . . . The 4th March will come with a fatal suddenness for all the plotters and expecters and adjustment-mongers. Just at the proper moment, not a moment too soon nor too late, you spoke a word which will help to clear the air."

Others wrote correcting the statement with regard to signatures in different towns. Some in a few words exposed the petition. Professor Convers Francis wrote from Cambridge: "The big Boston petition, so far as I can learn, is regarded here as a piece of gammon, except, perhaps, in certain quarters of the business world." Rev. R. S. Storrs, the venerable divine, wrote from Braintree: "A great hoax, that famous petition for the Crittenden Compromise!" This testimony, which might be extended indefinitely, will relieve Massachusetts from a painful complicity, and help keep her history bright.

The resolutions of the Boston Common Council did not fare better than the petition. Among newspapers, the *Boston Advertiser* remarked: —

"It is hardly necessary for us to say that we do not concur in all respects in the policy which Mr. Sumner is understood to follow at this crisis; but in the matter of this petition we certainly hold that he was plainly right. And we are led to this belief by observing the industrious efforts made by those who urged the signing of the petition to conceal the true meaning of the scheme which is known as Mr. Crittenden's. . . . . It appears to us also that Mr. Sumner gave not only the most friendly, but also a most natural, account of the manner in which a large number of these petitioners must have been led to this singular mistake."

The *New York Tribune* stated the case.

"A great many dull people, and a few clever ones, lately signed a petition asking Congress to adopt the Crittenden Compromise. When this document was taken up in the Senate, Mr. Sumner said, with much calmness and in the most courteous spirit, that he believed the signers had so high a regard for the name of Crittenden that they had put their signatures to a paper which they could not have fully understood in all its obligations, bearings, and propositions. This was a very gentle letting-down of the Bostonians, much more tender treatment than they deserved. Nevertheless, the remark raised a breeze in the respectable city, such as only a small thing can create in that place. It would never do to say that any Boston man or boy could sign a paper the whole of which he had not read and digested. So the Common Council, of all bodies in that town, took up the matter, and actu-

ally passed a vote of censure on Senator Sumner for mildly hinting that the signers aforesaid were rather hasty than wicked, stupid, or weak."

A sonnet by David A. Wasson, which appeared at this time, expresses gratitude to Mr. Sumner, with small sympathy for compromise in any form.

"TO CHARLES SUMNER.

"Thou and the stars, our Sumner, still shine on!
No dark will dim, no spending waste thy ray;
And we as soon could doubt the Milky Way,
Whether enduring were its silver zone,
As question of thy truth. Their light is gone
Whose beam was borrowed: ever will Accident,
Upon a day, the garment it hath lent
Strip off, — make beggars of its kings anon.
Thou and the stars eternal, inly fed
From God's own bosom with celestial light,
Must needs emit the glory in ye bred;
Alike it is your nature to be bright:
And I, while thou art shining overhead,
Know God is with us in the gloomy night."

DUTY AND STRENGTH OF THE COMING ADMINISTRATION.

FROM NOTES OF UNDELIVERED SPEECH ON THE VARIOUS PROPOSITIONS OF COMPROMISE, FEBRUARY, 1861.

MR. SUMNER contemplated a speech reviewing the various propositions of Compromise, but he never made it. The following passages are given, as proposed at the time.

. . . . . .

I WOULD not say a word except of kindness and respect for the Senator of Kentucky [Mr. CRITTENDEN]. But that Senator must pardon me, if I insist that he is entirely unreasonable in pressing his impracticable and unconstitutional propositions so persistently in the way of most important public business. Yesterday it hindered a great measure of Internal Improvement. To-day it blocks the admission of a State into this Union, being none other than Kansas, which has earned a better hospitality.

The Senator makes his appeal in the name of the Union. But I must remind him that he takes a poor way of showing that attachment to the Union which he avers. He turns round and lectures us who are devoted to the Union, when his lecture should be addressed to the avowed and open Disunionists in this Chamber. Nay, more, he actually sides with the Disunionists in their claims. Imagine Washington, Frank-

lin, Jefferson, John Jay, Andrew Jackson, or Henry Clay, in the place of the venerable Senator. They would not wheel towards the known friends of the Union, and ask an impossible surrender of sacred principles, but rather face to face address the Disunionists frankly, plainly, austerely, calling upon them to renounce their evil schemes, to acknowledge the National Constitution, and especially in this age of light to make no new demands for Slavery.

In reply to the Senator, who so constantly lectures us, I say, look to the good examples of our history; take counsel of the Spirit of Nationalism, rather than Sectionalism, and be willing to defend the Constitution *as it is*, rather than *patch it over* with propositions which our fathers would have disowned.

. . . . .

Putting aside all question of concession or compromise, the single question remains, *How shall we treat the seceding States?* And this is the question which the new Administration will be called to meet. I see well that it will naturally bear much and forbear long, — that it will be moved by principle, and not by passion, — and that it will adopt the harsh instrumentalities of power only when all other things have failed. And I see well the powerful allies which will be enlisted on its side. There will be the civilization of the Christian world, speaking with the innumerable voices of the press, and constituting a Public Opinion of irresistible energy. There will be the great contemporary example of Italy, after a slumber of centuries aroused to assertion of her rights, — and of Russia also, now completing that memorable act of Emancipation by which Freedom is assured to twenty millions of serfs. There will be also

the concurring action of European powers, which, turning with disgust from a new confederacy founded on Human Slavery, will refuse to recognize it in the Family of Nations. There will be also the essential weakness of Slavery with the perils of servile insurrection, which, under the influence of this discussion, must become more and more manifest in every respect. There will be also the essential strength of Freedom, as a principle, carrying victory in its right hand. And there will be Time, which is at once Reformer and Pacificator. Such are some of the allies sure to be on the side of the Administration.

FOREIGN RELATIONS: ARBITRATION.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, ADVISING THE PRESIDENT TO SUBMIT THE SAN JUAN BOUNDARY QUESTION TO ARBITRATION, IN THE SENATE, MARCH 19, 1861.

BY the withdrawal of Southern Senators, the Republicans were left with a majority in the Senate, enabling them to reorganize the Standing Committees, which was done March 8, 1861. At the head of the Finance Committee was Mr. Fessenden, instead of Mr. Hunter, — of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Trumbull, instead of Mr. Bayard, — of the Military Committee, Mr. Wilson, instead of Mr. Jefferson Davis, — and of the Naval Committee, Mr. Hale, instead of Mr. Mallory. Mr. Sumner was appointed Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in place of Mr. Mason, of Virginia, who had held this position from December 8, 1851. With the former on the new Committee were Messrs. Collamer, of Vermont, Doolittle, of Wisconsin, Harris, of New York, Douglas, of Illinois, Polk, of Missouri, and Breckinridge, of Kentucky. The appointment of Mr. Sumner to this important position was contrasted with his treatment at an earlier day, when the omission of his name from any committee was justified on the ground that he was "outside of any healthy political organization in this country," and this Senatorial sally was received with "laughter."[1] Mr. Hale and Mr. Chase were in the same category. Only Democrats and Whigs were accepted: such was the Law of Slavery. At last this was all changed.

The reorganization of the Committees attracted the attention of the press at home and abroad. It was properly recognized as marking a change from old to new. The London *Star*, in an elaborate article on the transition, welcomed especially the new Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Relations.

"The Republican Senators have selected for the Chairman of this Com-

[1] Speech of Hon. Jesse D. Bright, December 13, 1852: Congressional Globe, 32d Cong. 2d Sess., p. 40.

mittee the Hon. Charles Sumner, a statesman deservedly honored in this country, not only for his eloquence as an orator, but for his unswerving fidelity to the cause of Freedom. No man could have been chosen for this office in every respect more acceptable to the English people. It is not only as the Antislavery legislator, who, from the first moment that he took his seat in the Senate as the representative of Massachusetts, has ever raised his voice and given his vote for the hapless negro, — it is not only as the patriot who almost suffered martyrdom on the floor of the Senate Chamber from the ruffian hand of Preston S. Brooks, that the English people will be disposed to regard his appointment with hearty approval: he has established other claims to our sympathy and admiration, which we must not be slow to recognize. Mr. Sumner is well known in this country — scarcely less, indeed, than in America — as the stanch friend of Peace. Years ago, in his famous oration on the True Glory of Nations, he set forth the advantages of a pacific policy, with arguments as cogent and irresistible as those which have been employed by Mr. Cobden, and with an eloquence of language and a fertility of illustration which revived the oratory of classic times. . . . .

"And if during the period of Mr. Lincoln's administration causes of dispute should unhappily arise between America and Great Britain, or any other foreign power, Mr. Sumner will not fail to point to *arbitration as the only reasonable and satisfactory mode* of settling international differences. *He will not, if he can help it, permit San Juan to be made a casus belli*, or tolerate any more of those periodical expeditions against the weak and effeminate republics of South America, by which Mr. Buchanan and his predecessors treated with contempt the solemn injunctions of the Fathers of the Republic, that their posterity should avoid the fatal quicksands of European diplomacy, and abstain from interneddling with the affairs of other states."

The very questions anticipated by the London journal were presented at an early day, even before its article could reach Washington. The advice of the Senate was asked by the President on submitting the San Juan Question to arbitration.

March 16, 1861, the following Message from President Lincoln was read in Executive Session, and on motion of Mr. Sumner referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"To the Senate: —

"The Senate has transmitted to me a copy of the Message sent by my predecessor to that body on the 21st day of February last, proposing to take its advice on the subject of a proposition made by the British Government through its minister here to refer the matter in controversy between that Government and the Government of the United States to the arbitrament of the King of Sweden and Norway, the King of the Netherlands, or the Republic of the Swiss Confederation.

"In that Message my predecessor stated that he wished to submit to the Senate the precise questions following, namely: —

"'Will the Senate approve a Treaty referring to either of the sovereign powers above named the dispute now existing between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain concerning the boundary line between Vancouver's Island and the American continent? In case the referee shall find himself unable to decide where the line is by the description of it in the Treaty of June 15, 1846, shall he be authorized to establish a line according to the Treaty as nearly as possible? Which of the three powers named by Great Britain as an arbiter shall be chosen by the United States?'

"I find no reason to disapprove of the course of my predecessor in this important matter, but, on the contrary, I not only shall receive the advice of the Senate thereon cheerfully, but I respectfully ask the Senate for their advice on the three questions before recited.

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

"WASHINGTON, March 16, 1861."

From this Message it appears that the subject had been already before the Senate on the submission of President Buchanan in the last days of his Administration. In his Message the latter stated these precise questions: —

"Will the Senate approve a treaty referring to either of the sovereign powers above named [Sweden, the Netherlands, or Switzerland] the dispute now existing between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain concerning the boundary line between Vancouver's Island and the American continent?

"In case the referee shall find himself unable to decide where the line is by the description of it in the Treaty of June 15, 1846, shall he be authorized to establish a line according to the Treaty as nearly as possible?

"Which of the three powers named by Great Britain as an arbiter shall be chosen by the United States?"

February 27, 1861, Mr. Mason, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following Resolution, directly responsive to the questions proposed.

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of the Senate the boundary in dispute between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States should be referred to the arbitrament and final award of an umpire to be agreed on between the two Governments; that such umpire should, if practicable, determine said boundary as the same is prescribed in the Treaty aforesaid; or if that be not practicable, then that he be authorized to establish a boundary, conforming as nearly as may be to that provided by said Treaty.

"And that, of the three powers referred to in the Message of the President, the Senate would indicate as such umpire the Republic of the Swiss Confederation."

This was the last diplomatic act of Mr. Mason as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

March 19, 1861, Mr. Sumner submitted the following Report, which was his first diplomatic act as Chairman.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the Message of the President of the United States dated the 16th instant, with the documents accompanying it, have had the same under consideration, and now report.

THE Treaty concluded between Great Britain and the United States on the 15th of June, 1846, provided in its first Article that the line of boundary between the territories of her Britannic Majesty and those of the United States, from the point on the 49th parallel of north latitude, to which it was ascertained, should be continued westward along this parallel, "to the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island, and thence southerly, through the middle of said channel and of Fuca's Straits, to the Pacific Ocean." When the commissioners appointed by the two Governments to mark the boundary line came to that part of it required to run southerly through the channel dividing the continent from Vancouver's Island, they differed entirely in their opinions, not only concerning the true point of deflection from the 49th parallel, but also as to the channel intended in the Treaty. After long discussion, producing no result, they reported a disagreement to their respective Governments. Since then the two Governments, through their ministers here and at London, have carried on a voluminous correspondence on the matter in controversy, each sustaining the conclusion of its own commissioner,

and neither yielding in any degree to the other. Meanwhile the unsettled condition of this question produced serious local disturbance, and on one occasion threatened to destroy the harmonious relations existing between Great Britain and the United States, causing serious anxiety.

If our construction of the Treaty be right, the island of San Juan, with other small islands, will fall to the United States, while, if the British interpretation be adopted, these islands will be on their side of the line. President Buchanan, in his Message to the Senate of February 21, 1861, declared his conviction that the territory thus in dispute "is ours by the Treaty fairly and impartially construed." But the British Government, on their side, insist that it is theirs. The argument on both sides seems to have been exhausted.

Under these circumstances, it appears from the correspondence submitted to the Senate, that General Cass, Secretary of State, by letter of June 25, 1860, to Lord Lyons, the British Minister at Washington, invited the British Government to make a proposition of adjustment. Here are his words:—

"And I have it further in charge to inform your Lordship, that this Government is ready to receive and fairly to consider any proposition which the British Government may be disposed to make for a mutually acceptable adjustment, with an earnest hope that a satisfactory arrangement will speedily put an end to all danger of the recurrence of those grave questions which have more than once threatened to interrupt that good understanding which both countries have so many powerful motives to maintain."

The reply of the British Government to this invitation was communicated by Lord Lyons, in a letter to

General Cass, dated December 10, 1860, in the course of which he uses the following language.

"In reference to the line of the water boundary intended by the Treaty, with respect to which also her Majesty's Government have been invited by the United States Government to make a proposition for its adjustment, I am instructed to inform you that her Majesty's Government are glad to reciprocate the friendly sentiments expressed in your note of the 25th of June, and will not hesitate to respond to the invitation which has been made to them.

"It appears to her Majesty's Government that the argument on both sides being nearly exhausted, and neither party having succeeded in producing conviction on the other, the question can only be settled by arbitration."

Lord Lyons then proceeds to details connected with the offered arbitration, and, in behalf of his Government, proposes that the King of the Netherlands, or the King of Sweden and Norway, or the President of the Federal Council of Switzerland should be invited to be arbiter.

Upon these facts the President submits to the consideration of the Senate the following interrogatories.

"Will the Senate approve a Treaty referring to either of the sovereign powers above named the dispute now existing between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain concerning the boundary line between Vancouver's Island and the American continent?

"In case the referee shall find himself unable to decide where the line is by the description of it in the Treaty of June 15, 1846, shall he be authorized to establish a line according to the Treaty as nearly as possible?

"Which of the three powers named by Great Britain as an arbiter shall be chosen by the United States?"

The Committee, in conclusion, recommend to the Senate the adoption of the following Resolution.

"*Resolved*, That, in pursuance of the Message of the President of the 16th instant, the Senate advises a reference of the existing dispute between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain, concerning the boundary line which separates Vancouver's Island and the American continent, to the arbitration of a friendly power, with authority to determine the line according to the provisions of the Treaty of 15th June, 1846, but without authority to establish any line other than that provided for in the Treaty.

"And of the three powers named by Great Britain, the Senate advises that the Republic of Switzerland be chosen by the United States as arbiter."

On two different days the Senate proceeded with this resolution, when, March 27, 1861, the day before the close of the Session, it was ordered that its further consideration be postponed to the second Monday of December next. This was done on the suggestion that the time was not propitious for the arbitration of a disputed boundary line. April 12, Fort Sumter was bombarded.

A difference between the resolution of Mr. Mason and that of Mr. Sumner will be noted. The former declared that the umpire "should, if practicable, determine said boundary as the same is prescribed in the Treaty aforesaid; or if that be not practicable, then that he be authorized to establish a boundary, *conforming as nearly as may be to that provided by said Treaty.*" The latter resolution declared, that the arbiter should have "authority to determine the line according to the provisions of the Treaty of 15th June, 1846, *but without authority to establish any line other than that provided for in the Treaty.*" The obvious purpose was to prevent a compromise line. This same purpose appears in the terms of the Treaty between the United States and Great Britain, signed at Washington, May 8, 1871, where, after mentioning the Article of the original Treaty under which the question arose, it is declared, that, "whereas the Government of her Britannic Majesty claims that such boundary line should, under the terms of the Treaty

above recited, be run through the Rosario Straits, and the Government of the United States claims that it should be run through the Canal de Haro, it is agreed that the respective claims of the Government of the United States and of the Government of her Britannic Majesty shall be submitted to the arbitration and award of his Majesty the Emperor of Germany, who, having regard to the abovementioned Article of the said Treaty, shall decide thereupon, finally, and without appeal, *which of these claims is most in accordance with the true interpretation of the Treaty of June* 15, 1846." This provision follows substantially the early resolution of Mr. Sumner.

BEGINNING OF THE CONFLICT.

Speech before the Third Massachusetts Rifles, in the Armory at New York, April 21, 1861.

After adjournment of the Senate, Mr. Sumner remained for some time in Washington, as was his habit. Meanwhile occurred the bombardment of Fort Sumter, and the President's Proclamation, calling for seventy-five thousand men to suppress insurrectionary combinations, "and to cause the laws to be duly executed." On the afternoon of 18th April, 1861, amidst the general commotion, he left on his way to Boston, stopping over night at Baltimore, where an incident occurred, which, besides illustrating the state of the country, helps to explain the brief speech which follows.

On arrival by the train, Mr. Sumner drove at once to Barnum's Hotel, where he entered his name in the open book. Taking a walk before dark in the principal street, he was recognized by excited persons, whose manner and language went beyond any ordinary occasion.[1] Early in the evening he called on a family friend, with whom he took tea, surrounded by her children. Leaving her house about nine o'clock, he walked slowly back to the hotel. When descending Fayette Street by its side, he could not but observe an enormous assemblage of people, with very little apparent government, in the open square at the foot of the street. Entering the private door, which was at some distance from the riotous crowd, he came upon a gentleman, who, addressing him by name, expressed surprise at seeing him there, saying, "That mob in the square is after you. Their leaders have been to the hotel and demanded you. They were told that you were out, — that nobody knew where you were, and that you had probably left town"; and he wound up by insisting that it was not safe for Mr. Sumner to continue at the hotel, or anywhere in town, if his place of stopping were known. Without reply to this notice, Mr. Sumner walked down

[1] A telegraphic despatch in the Philadelphia *Inquirer* records the feeling. "Senator Sumner, who is now stopping at Barnum's Hotel, causes much excitement. There is great indignation felt among all parties at his presence among us."

the long corridor of the hotel, and, turning into the office, asked for his key. At once Mr. Barnum, with one of his assistants, took him into a small back room, where they explained the condition of things, narrated the visit of the leaders, and the answer they were able to give, by which the mob were turned aside; but this temporary relief left them still anxious, especially if Mr. Sumner's return should be suspected, and therefore they must request him to leave the hotel; and this was enforced by saying that his longer stay was perilous to the hotel as well as to himself, and that he must find shelter somewhere else. Mr. Sumner, while declaring his sincere regret that he should be the innocent occasion of peril to the hotel, said that there was nowhere else for him to go, — that he had no right to carry peril to the house of a friend, — that it was impossible for him to do this, — that he had come to the hotel as a traveller, and he must claim his rights, believing that in so large a structure there was more safety than in a private house, even if there were any such where he could go. The interview ended in conducting him to a chamber on a long entry of the third story, where all the rooms were alike, when, after saying that nobody in the hotel but themselves would know where he was, they left him alone. From the window which opened on the street at the side of the hotel, he could see the swaying multitude, and hear their voices. In the gray of the morning he left for the Philadelphia Railroad.[1]

On the way to Philadelphia, he met a long train for Baltimore, containing the Sixth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteers, hurrying to the defence of the national capital. It was the first regiment of volunteers he had seen, and he was struck by the gayety of soldier life, which overflowed as the train passed. On his arrival at Philadelphia, the telegraph was announcing the tragedy which had befallen them.

The troops were passing through Baltimore from the Philadelphia station, in the large horse-cars, and a portion had arrived at the Washington station, when those behind were set upon by a mob, the successor of that at the hotel on the preceding evening. Before they could leave the station, the streets were barricaded, and the rails removed, so that they were obliged to make their way on foot, amidst the growing fury of the mob, which had increased to ten thousand. Stones, bricks, and other murderous missiles were thrown at them. Then came pistol-shots. As the soldiers saw their comrades fall, they fired. Several of the assailants dropped upon the pavements, and others were wounded. And so for two miles they fought their way to the Washington station. Of the troops, four were killed, and thirty-six wounded.

[1] The lady at whose house Mr. Sumner took tea was warned to leave without delay, unless she was willing to brave the vengeance of the mob; and she left.

That evening the regiment quartered at Washington, in the Senate Chamber.[1] Thus, on the 19th of April, 1861, began and closed the first encounter of the terrible war at hand.

The mob now reigned in Baltimore. Gun-shops were plundered. Other shops were closed. The President was notified that no more troops could pass through the city, unless they fought their way. That night the bridges on the railroad to Philadelphia were burnt, so that this great avenue was closed.[2]

On the 21st of April, the Third Battalion of Massachusetts Rifles, with Hon. Charles Devens as Major, consisting of two hundred and sixty-six men, arrived at New York from Worcester, on their way to the scene of action, and quartered in the armory of the famous New York Seventh, which had left on the preceding afternoon. On a visit to the armory by Mr. Sumner, the Battalion was called into line, and he made the following remarks.

MAJOR DEVENS, SOLDIERS, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS OF MASSACHUSETTS: —

BEING in New York, on my way home from Washington to our beloved Massachusetts, and learning that you also were here on your way to duty, I have called, that I might have the privilege of looking upon your faces. [*Cheers.*] Your commanding officer, whom I have known long in other walks of life, does me the honor of inviting me to say a few words. If I have yielded, it is because he is irresistible, for I feel in my soul that action, and not speech, is needed now. [*Cheers.*] Elsewhere it has been my part to speak. It is your part now to act. [*Applause.*] Nor do I doubt that you will act as becomes the Commonwealth that has committed to you her name. [*Cheers.*]

I cannot see before me so large a number of the sons of Massachusetts, already moving to the scene of trial,

[1] Schouler's History of Massachusetts in the Civil War, p. 97.
[2] Rebellion Record, Vol. I. Diary, pp. 84, 85.

without feeling anew the loss we have just encountered: I allude to the death, at Baltimore, of devoted fellow-citizens, who had sprung forward so promptly at the call of country. As I heard that they had fallen, my soul was touched. And yet, when I thought of the cause for which they met death, I said to myself, that, for the sake of Massachusetts, ay, and for their own sake, I would not have it otherwise. [*Enthusiastic applause.*] They have died well, for they died at the post of duty, and so dying have become an example and a name in history, while Massachusetts, that sent them forth, adds new memories to a day already famous in her calendar, and links the present with the past. It was on the 19th of April that they died, and their blood was the first offering of patriotism in the great cause which snatched them from the avocations of peace. Thus have they passed at once into companionship with those forefathers who on the 19th of April, 1775, made also the offering of their blood. [*Loud cheers.*] Lexington is not alone. As on that historic field, Massachusetts blood is again the first to be spilled, and in a conflict which is but a continuation of the other; and these dying volunteers have placed Massachusetts once more foremost, as on that morning which heralded Independence. [*Cheers.*] Therefore I would not have it otherwise. [*Cheers.*] Nor do I doubt that the day we now deplore will be followed, as was that earlier day, by certain triumph. [*Cheers.*]

Those other times, when our forefathers struggled for Independence against the British power, were often said "to try men's souls"; and these words are yet repeated to depict those trials. But, witnessing the willingness and alacrity with which patriot citizens now offer them-

selves for country, and to die, if need be, I look in vain for signs that souls are tried. [*Cheers.*] And yet I cannot disguise from you, soldiers, that there are hardships and perils in your path. But what is victory, unless through hardship and peril? [*Cheers.*] Be brave, then, and do the duty to which you are called; and if you need any watchword, let it be, *Massachusetts*, THE CONSTITUTION, and FREEDOM! [*Loud applause from the soldiers.*]

On the same evening, the Battalion embarked on board the transport "Ariel" for Annapolis, where it arrived on the morning of April 24th, and on the 2d of May was transferred to Fort McHenry, in the harbor of Baltimore. There it remained to the end of its term of service.

PASSPORTS FOR COLORED CITIZENS.

NOTE TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, JUNE 27, 1861.

THE question of Passports for Colored Citizens was embarrassed by the Dred Scott decision, and the usage of the State Department, refusing to recognize colored persons as citizens. The position of the latter was set forth in a letter of Mr. Thomas, Assistant Secretary, communicating the judgment of Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State.

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, November 4, 1856.

"Your letters of the 29th ult. and 3d inst., requesting passports for eleven colored persons, have been received, and I am directed by the Secretary to inform you that the papers transmitted by you do not warrant the Department in complying with your request. The question whether free negroes are citizens is not now presented for the first time, but has repeatedly arisen in the administration of both the National and State governments. In 1821 a controversy arose as to whether free persons of color were citizens of the United States, within the intent and meaning of the Acts of Congress regulating foreign and coasting trade, so as to be qualified to command vessels, and Wirt, Attorney-General, decided that they were not, and he moreover held that the words 'citizens of the United States' were used in the Acts of Congress in the same sense as in the Constitution. This view is also fully sustained in a recent opinion of the present Attorney-General.

"The judicial decisions of the country are to the same effect..... Such being the construction of the Constitution in regard to free persons of color, it is conceived that they cannot be regarded, when beyond the jurisdiction of this Government, as entitled to the full rights of citizens; but the Secretary directs me to say, that, though the Department could not certify that such persons are citizens of the United States, yet, if satisfied of the truth of the facts, it would give a certificate that they were born in the United States, are free, and that the Government thereof would regard it to be its duty to protect them, if wronged by a foreign government while within its jurisdiction for a legal and proper purpose."[1]

Amidst the general anxieties of the time this important question

[1] McPherson's Political History of the United States, p. 382, *note*.

was presented for revision. A colored youth of Boston, son of Robert Morris, Esq., a practitioner in the courts of Massachusetts, unable to obtain a college education at home, proposed to seek it in France, where there was no exclusion on account of color, and Mr. Sumner, in a written communication to the Secretary of State, requested a passport for him, at the same time inclosing the description of his person duly authenticated, in which his complexion was said to be "colored" and his hair "short and curly." There being some delay, Mr. Sumner called at the Department to urge personally his formal application. Mr. Seward did not like to issue a passport on the description furnished, but at the same time would furnish a passport to Mr. Sumner for anybody whom he certified to be a citizen, without description. The authenticated description was then returned, and Mr. Sumner, at Mr. Seward's own desk, and on the ordinary despatch paper of the Department, wrote at once the following.

WASHINGTON, 27 June, '61.

SIR, — Please send me a passport for Robert Morris, Jr., of Boston, a citizen of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

The passport was duly issued, bearing date June 29, 1861, and Mr. Sumner's note was filed in the Passport Bureau, being the only paper in the case.

The opinion of the Attorney-General, affirming the citizenship of colored freemen, November 29, 1862,[1] settled this question definitively.

[1] Opinions of the Attorneys-General, Vol. X. p. 382.

OBJECT OF THE WAR.

PROCEEDINGS IN THE SENATE, ON THE CRITTENDEN RESOLUTION DECLARING THE OBJECT OF THE WAR, JULY 24 AND 25, 1861.

JULY 4th, 1861, Congress met in extraordinary session, at the call of the President, to make provision for the welfare of the country, and especially for the prosecution of the war. Meanwhile, Mr. Crittenden, so famous for his attempt at Compromise, had ceased to be a Senator, but he had become a member of the other House. Here he introduced a resolution, declaring the object of the war, which was adopted by the House with only two dissenting votes.

July 24, the same resolution, in nearly the same words, was introduced into the Senate by Hon. Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, afterwards President, who pressed a vote at once, even without having it printed. On Mr. Sumner's objection it was postponed. His few words in making this objection have significance, as showing his feeling towards Mr. Johnson at that time, and also his unwillingness that the Senate should commit itself hastily to a proposition which, under the name of the "Crittenden Resolution," was destined to play an important part.

Mr. Sumner said: —

I AM unwilling to stand in the way of any desire of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON]. I hesitate, therefore, to use the privilege, under the rules, of objecting to a resolution on the day of its introduction; but I do think, in view of its importance, that it ought at least to be printed, so that we may have an opportunity of reading it carefully and considering it well, before we act upon it. Therefore I object to its consideration at this time. I wish the Senator to

understand that it is with great respect for himself, and with a desire to do really what the occasion, as I think, requires. I hope the Senator himself will consent that it lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. Johnson said that he would not object, and the resolution was ordered to be printed, as follows.

"*Resolved*, — That the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the Southern States, now in revolt against the Constitutional Government, and in arms around the capital; that in this national emergency, Congress, banishing all feeling of mere passion or resentment, will recollect only its duty to the whole country; that this war is not prosecuted upon our part in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, nor for the purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and all laws made in pursuance thereof, and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired; that as soon as these objects are accomplished, the war ought to cease."

The next day the resolution was taken up, on motion of Mr. Johnson. Mr. Trumbull objected to the allegation in it that the disunionists were "in arms around the capital," which in his opinion was not true; and he added, that, in his opinion, the revolt was occasioned by people who are not here or in this vicinity: it was started in South Carolina. He objected also to the clause that the war was "not prosecuted for any purpose of conquest or subjugation," — on which he said, "I trust this war *is* prosecuted for the purpose of subjugating all rebels and traitors who are in arms against the Government." For these reasons he voted in the negative. Every other Republican present voted in the affirmative, except Mr. Sumner, who declined to vote. His name does not appear in the record.

This resolution was general in terms, but specious. Though not mentioning Slavery expressly, or interfering with the requirement of military necessity, it was considered at the time as a safeguard of Slavery, even to the Fugitive Slave Bill itself, which was included under the words, "the supremacy of the Constitution, and all laws made in pursuance thereof." Nor could it be forgotten that it was first brought forward by the same person who, during the previous winter, as Senator from Kentucky, had most pertinaciously urged an odious compromise, by which Slavery was to be intrenched in the Constitution, and

made dominant in the National Government. Mr. Sumner, always sensitive to any recognition of Slavery, saw in it an effort to commit Congress the wrong way, so that inaction on Slavery should be the policy of the war, when, to his mind, the sooner Slavery was attacked, the better. His objection to the resolution was radical; but, unwilling to separate openly from political associates, anxious also with regard to the President, who held back, and hoping that time would bring general concurrence in striking at Slavery, he was silent, and contented himself by withholding his vote, so that he was not committed to the resolution in any respect.

This statement is made to explain the progress of events, and also because Mr. Sumner's course was the occasion of comment, and even of hostile criticism, at the time.

SYMPATHIES OF THE CIVILIZED WORLD NOT TO BE REPELLED.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, AGAINST INCREASE OF TEN PER CENT ON ALL FOREIGN DUTIES, JULY 29, 1861.

IN the consideration of the Tariff Bill at this session, Mr. Sumner differed from friends on some of the points involved. One of these differences occurred on his motion, July 29, 1861, to strike out the following clause: —

"That, in addition to the duties now imposed by law on goods, wares, and merchandise not enumerated in the foregoing section, and on all goods not herein otherwise provided for, hereafter imported from foreign countries, there shall be levied, collected, and paid *a duty of ten per centum ad valorem, to include all merchandise subject to or exempt from duty by former laws.*"

On this motion he spoke as follows.

MR. PRESIDENT, — I think we had better take a vote on the simple proposition, because in that way we shall arrive at the precise wishes of the Senate. I therefore move to strike out the words just read; and if I can have the attention of the Senate for two minutes, I think I can explain why they should be stricken out.

It will be remembered that in the latter days of the last session a new tariff was adopted; but, owing to the disturbed state of the country, and the impediments to commerce, it is not too much to say that we have no present experience of its operation. We do not know

to what extent it will supply revenue. While thus ignorant of its operation, it is proposed to make an important change, being nothing less than to pile another story upon what is already criticised as too high. In addition to all existing duties, we are asked to impose a further duty of ten per cent. In the present exigencies of the country, if there were reasonable assurance that out of such extraordinary tax the revenue would be advanced, I should have nothing to say against it, — on the contrary, I should hold up both hands for it; but, so far as I am informed, — and I have taken pains to inform myself, — there is no reasonable ground to believe that the addition of ten per cent extra upon present duties would yield any additional revenue.

MR. POLK. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him ——

MR. SUMNER. Certainly.

MR. POLK. I will ask if the result of his investigations is not that the addition of ten per cent would actually decrease the revenue?

MR. SUMNER. The Senator properly directs attention to an important point. I said there was no reasonable assurance that there would be an increase of revenue. I believe that I may go further, as the Senator has suggested, and say that a tariff so far prohibitory will actually diminish instead of increasing revenue. Where then will be your revenue? Revenue comes from commerce, and is just in proportion to the extent of commerce; but if you make commerce impossible, where is your revenue? You kill the bird that lays the golden egg.

There is a pleasant story, which I remember to have

heard, of a shopkeeper who once announced to his friends that before breakfast he had increased his fortune by ten per cent; but, on inquiry, it was ascertained that he had merely marked his goods on hand at an increased price of ten per cent, and that was his boasted increase. I much fear that this additional ten per cent will be equally vain for the increase of our national revenue.

But, Mr. President, while the advantages of this proposed increase are all uncertain, there are disadvantages that are certain. It will add to the bad name which, unhappily, the tariff of the last session has already with those disposed to criticise it, and especially with foreign countries. At this moment, when every suggestion of prudence dictates that in our relations with foreign countries we should be governed by a supreme policy of moderation, conciliation, and good-will, you propose to take a step which, to say the least of it, will be regarded as indicative of hostility or of indifference. Now, whatever may be the sentiments and the feelings of European Governments with regard to us, it is perfectly clear that the laboring classes of Europe do sympathize with us in our present struggle; and all those sympathies you turn aside, when you impose prohibitory duties which cut off a market for their labor. I am therefore, Mr. President, opposed to this increase on two positive grounds: first, because its advantages are uncertain; secondly, because its disadvantages are certain.

Mr. Fessenden replied, saying, among other things, —

"I am very glad that the Senator has made the remarks he has, and I desire to say a few words in reply, more par-

ticularly to the last portion of his speech. As Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it being his duty to keep on the best possible terms with all foreign powers, he had a right, perhaps, to say what he has said; but, after all, that is not the question. I would suggest to the honorable Senator, that there is something else to be considered, at the present time, besides the good or bad opinion which certain foreign ministers and others may have of our domestic policy."

Then again: —

"Now the Senator says: 'Be careful how you lay these duties on, because foreign countries will be offended at us.' What right has a foreign country to make any question about what we choose to do with reference to these matters, — to say, when we are in a state of war, and struggling for national existence even, that we shall not impose duties which are necessary to enable us to prosecute that war, because, forsooth, it may affect the interests of foreign gentlemen?"

Here Mr. Sumner interposed: —

I know the Senator does not intend to misstate my argument. I assumed that there would be no increase of revenue from this additional ten per cent, — at least, that the advantages of the increase were uncertain, doubtful; and then that it was very certain there would be disadvantages.

Mr. Fessenden continued at some length, and with much earnestness said: —

"I have heard this argument adduced out of doors, and this talk about how foreign powers might feel respecting the duties we choose to impose upon articles imported into this country. Why, Sir, I say the argument is nothing less than an insult. . . . . I say, therefore, that no people have a

right to be offended with us for acting according to our own views of our own interests. They would not have it in time of peace, and much less could they have it in time of war."

Mr. Sumner restated his position.

MR. PRESIDENT, — The Senator and myself are perfectly agreed in our main object. Here there is no difference between us. Each desires to secure the largest revenue. For myself, I know no bounds to this desire. The simple question is, How will this be best accomplished? The Senator puts forward the proposition to increase by ten per cent all existing duties, and he does this while still ignorant of the actual working of the tariff established in March. To our inexperience with regard to that tariff he would add further inexperience with regard to the effect of the proposed increase. Now this may be good policy; but it does not seem so to me. The commerce of the country cannot bear such constant change, especially in the direction proposed. The revenue will not gain by it.

For good or for evil, what is familiarly known as the "Morrill Tariff" has been adopted. The commerce of the country has taken note of its requisitions, and is now ready to govern itself accordingly. And it seems to me that the House of Representatives acted wisely, in seeking to increase the revenue by duties on selected articles, which it was thought could bear the tax, rather than by wholesale change, which must cause the whole system to be remodelled. In this respect the House bill has an advantage over that brought forward by the Senator from Rhode Island [MR. SIMMONS] and maintained so zealously by the Senator from Maine [MR. FESSENDEN].

But the Senator from Maine says he is unwilling to hearken to suggestions from foreign nations.

MR. FESSENDEN. Not at all. I said no such thing as that. I am perfectly willing to hearken to all suggestions, if they are respectfully made, and do not assume a right to dictate to us.

MR. SUMNER. Pray, who has dictated to us, or who assumes any such right? And as to suggestions, which the Senator says he welcomes, I am not aware that any foreign nation, or any person representing any foreign nation, has made even a suggestion that could come within the criticism, swift as it is, of the Senator. Nor, indeed, am I aware of any suggestion in any form to this body. Surely the Senator is mistaken. He must in his imagination exaggerate something that he has heard; or perhaps he misinterprets something that fell from myself.

Let me not be misunderstood. I have said that this ten per cent proposition, if adopted, will give your tariff a bad name among those who are disposed to criticise it, and especially with foreign countries. Was I not right? Is it not true? Willingly I take the censure of the Senator, while I strive at this moment to secure for my country sympathy from every quarter, even from foreign nations; nor shall I be disturbed by anything which fell from the Senator. I am accustomed to criticism in this body. And I beg to say that I shrink from no responsibility which belongs to my position. If duty requires that foreign nations should be encountered by a policy harassing to their industry, I shall take my full share of this grave responsibility; but until I see the path of duty in that direction, I

hope that I may be pardoned, if I prefer a policy doubly commended as most beneficial to us and least hurtful to them.

I am unwilling that my country at this moment should pursue a shadow, and in the end find that it has gained nothing but ill-will. Strong as we are, we cannot afford to augment the odium created by our late tariff. Better husband our resources, — among which I place the sympathies of the civilized world, and of those laboring classes whose industry must suffer by your act, without, I fear, any corresponding benefit to us.

The amendment of Mr. Sumner was lost.

END OF VOLUME V.

Cambridge: Electrotyped and Printed by Welch, Bigelow, & Co.

3 6105 06 130 242 3